QUAESTIONES PROPERTIANAE

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

J.M. BREMER · L.F. JANSSEN · H. PINKSTER

H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM SEXAGESIMUM NONUM

HANS-CHRISTIAN GÜNTHER

QUAESTIONES PROPERTIANAE

QUAESTIONES PROPERTIANAE

BY

HANS-CHRISTIAN GÜNTHER

BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1997

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Günther, Hans Christian.
Quaestiones propertianae / by Hans-Christian Günther.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 169)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004107932 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Propertius, Sextus—Criticism, Textual. 2. Elegiac poetry, Latin—Criticism, Textual. 3. Love poetry, Latin—Criticism, Textual. 4. Rome—In literature. I. Title. II. Series.
PA6646.G86 1997
874'.01—dc21 97-3868
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
169. Günther, Hans Christian: Quaestiones propertianae. – 1997

Günther, Hans-Christian:
Quaestiones propertianae / by Hans-Christian Günther. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1997
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 169)
ISBN 90-04-10793-2

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 10793 2

© Copyright 1997 by Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface vii
Bibliography
  Editions and Commentaries of Propertius xiii
  Literature cited in Abbreviation xv
Sigla xix

Chapter One: Transposition 1
  1.1. Verse Transpositions in Propertius and the Transmission of the Second Book 1
  1.2. Minor Transpositions in II. xvi A 35
  1.3. Further Cases of Wholesale Transposition in Books III and IV 38
  1.4. Intentional Transposition and the Dislocation of Single Couplets 43

Appendix:
The Text of the Poems affected by Maior Dislocation 53

Chapter Two: Interpolation 67
  2.1. Interpolation in Lacunae 67
    2.1.1. Documented Interpolations in Lacunae 67
    2.1.2. Two Further Cases of Interpolation in Lacunae 81
  2.2. Word Interpolation 85
  2.3. Dislocation and Interpolation 115

Chapter Three: Some Remarks on Book and Poem Structure ... 133

Chapter Four: A Few Conclusions for the Textual Tradition of Propertius 157

Indices
  1. Index of Names and Subjects 165
  2. Index Locorum 168

PREFACE

„Oberste Pflicht muß das Verstehen der Schwierigkeiten bleiben. Wo wir die unumwunden anerkennen, da gibts ein Vorwärtskommen." W. Jäger, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles* (Berlin 1912) S. III

In the following pages I shall be trying to revive, at least to some extent, the two most infamous approaches to Propertian textual criticism. I do not wish to make long methodological apologies for that in advance but rather invite the reader to judge the evidence I shall present on its own merits without prejudice. The discredit into which both methods, wholesale verse transposition and the search for interpolations in Propertius, have fallen is, as far as it is justified, mainly due to the exaggerations of the most prominent advocates of the two methods in the past[1], in particular to the claim to solve most, if not all major problems in Propertius on the basis of one hypothesis alone. Yet the deplorable condition of the text of Propertius is certainly due to many different factors, among which dislocations and interpolation are just two possibilities. The general frame for each problem is, as far as necessary, set out in the relevant chapter; in addition I may refer the reader to the introduction to my *Exercitationes Sophocleae*, where I have presented some general thoughts on the aims and methods of 'Interpolationsforschung' today which *mutatis mutandis* are relevant for the second part of this study as well.

It will surely be impossible to arrive at a broad consensus among Propertian scholars on the status of the text of Propertius, and I am the last to delude myself about the inevitable uncertainties attached to any attempt to solve problems of the transmission which go beyond verbal corruption. Yet I hope that the arguments I shall put forward

---

[1] Radical transposition in the tradition of Scaliger's Propertius were advocated mainly by Carutti, Richmond and Housman (see below p. 1f. with n. 2); this line of research has been taken up in more recent times by Richardson, Goold and Heyworth. Interpolation was advocated as the major reason of damage to the text of Propertius by Jachmann and Knoche. After the sharp negative reaction against Jachmann's work (as regards Propertius Jachmann's most eminent adversary was E. Reitzenstein with his influential study *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz*, *Philologus* Suppl.-bd. 29, 2 [Leipzig 1936]) 'Interpolationsforschung' still waits to become a major trend in Propertian scholarship (see below p. 67ff.).

will at least provoke further thought even from those who disagree violently with my approach.

In what follows I shall argue that while interpolation certainly had an effect on the transmitted text of Propertius its range is rather limited and that it is not the major factor of damage to the text. In view of the rather complicated nature of several transpositions I shall advocate one might argue that interpolation *prima facie* is a much easier hypothesis; however, the real test must lie with the textual evidence of every single case and I cannot see so far convincing reasons for assuming interpolation as extensive as necessary if it really were the sole—or even the main—reason of the textual problems in Propertius. In particular one may find it difficult to prove interpolation in a text where verbal corruption is on such a high level as it certainly is in Propertius. I am aware that such eminent experts as Professors Butrica and Zwierlein have quite different views but I feel that it would be impossible to do justice to them if I discussed the proposals for deletion they had communicated to me by letter. The problem surely needs further attention and one very much hopes to see more future research in this field. Meanwhile I have left unaltered the parts of my text where I argue on general grounds for a rather limited role of interpolation in the textual transmission of Propertius.

I further wish to point out right from the start that after having been reluctant for a long time I have convinced myself that numerical structure plays a larger role in Latin poetry than is normally recognised. I am in full agreement with Professor Goold's insistence on the relevance of number patterns and on a kind of stanza composition for many if not most of Propertius' poems (see pp. 23f. of his Loeb edition), and I regard this as an important check for both transpositions and deletions. I am perfectly aware that many (probably most) scholars will be appaled by this approach a priori. In order to counter any suspicion of arbitrarily shifting around portions of text so that they may suit a preconceived structural pattern I wish to point out that all my conclusions on transposition, deletion or lacunae have been reached independently of structural considerations. Consequently I shall at first not present the structural reasons for every single case which may recommend a transposition or deletion, though I may hint at the structure of the resulting text occasionally, and I mark subdivisions in the texts printed in the appendix. Of course, one's views on book and poem structure and on the state of the text will to some extent be interdependent; I therefore shall attempt to present in a separate chapter a more comprehensive inquiry into book and poem structure in the light of my rearrangements of the text.

The textual tradition of Propertius has recently been set on a new basis in an exhaustive study by James Butrica, but his results have not found unanimous favour with Propertian scholars. In particular, La Penna in his review of Butrica's study and recently also Goold (3, 105f.; ed. p. 15f.) have rejected Butrica's view that several 15th century mss. (his v [Vat. lat. 3273, written 1427 in Florence by Antonio Beccadelli, 113 in Hanslik], r [Bodmer. 141, written 1466 in Florence by Johannes Petrus of Spoleto], u [Vat. Urb. lat. 641, written in Florence *c.* 1465-70, υ in Hanslik], m [Par. lat. 8233, written 1465 in Florence by Gherardo del Ciriagio, μ in Hanslik], s [Monac. Cim. 22, written *c.* 1460-70 in Florence by ?Jacopo Bracciolini, 101 in Hanslik], c [Casan. 15, written 1470 or 1471 in Rome by Giulio Pomponio Leto, 103 in Hanslik]), not descendant from A, represent an independent stream of transmission which does not go back to N but to a lost *gemellus* (his X). Butrica's hypothesis has however been accepted by Tarrant (*TT* 324-6) and by Heyworth (see Heyworth 2, who uses Λ for X) who in his unpublished Cambridge dissertation has reached similar results independently. Certainly some of Butrica's arguments appear to be rather thinly woven if considered in isolation and I have been sceptical myself for some time. Yet the strength of Butrica's reasoning lies in the combination of the textual evidence and historical considerations, and this combination makes indeed a strong case for believing in an additional source to N and A in the humanistic tradition of Propertius. I disagree however with Butrica's reconstruction of a common source for N and X (Λ) as opposed to A and I shall discuss the problem briefly in 2.2. The tripartite stemma suggested by Heyworth in his unpublished Cambridge dissertation (considered also by Butrica 76) seems more likely to me.

As regards the A-tradition La Penna (119) and Heyworth (2, 46) have demolished Butrica's claim that *Marc.* 443 (written 1453 in Padua by ?Giovanni Marcanova, Butrica's Z, ρ in Hanslik) is an independent descendant of Petrarch's copy of A from II. xxix onward; they have demonstrated that Z shares a common source with LP (as Professor Butrica tells me *per litteras* he is now sympathetic himself towards this view). La Penna (120) has, however, pointed out that the testimony of Z may well be of interest for the sometimes difficult reconstruction of Petrarch's copy. Z I could check *in situ* and I shall sometimes cite its readings; for the X (Λ) -mss. I rely on Heyworth's collations. Henceforward I shall use his sigla instead of Butrica's minuscules (i.e. the respective capital letters except for Butrica's v = Heyworth's T; furthermore Heyworth cites also *Parm. Pal.* 140 [J, written *c.* 1430-40 in Florence by Johannes Andreae de Colonia, 49 in Hanslik], *Vratisl. Univ. Akc.* 1948 KN 197 [K, written

in Padua 1469 or before, 67 in Hanslik] and *Vat. Capponianus* 196 [W, ?third quarter of the 15th cent., 132 in Hanslik], see Heyworth 3, 199) as well as his symbols Λ for X and Π for Petrarch's copy of A.

A number of friends and colleagues have put me in their debt by giving much valuable advice on my work. Professor Michael Reeve was kind enough to read my typescript at a very early stage and showed the way to proceed. I owe much more to his pertinent criticism than can be acknowledged in detail; his stimulating comments led to a thorough revision of the whole book much beyond the correction of the many individual errors he pointed out to me. In a later stage Professors James Butrica, G.P. Goold and Otto Zwierlein kindly agreed to comment on my work and made a large number of very helpful suggestions. To all of them I am deeply grateful. The greatest contribution however was made by Dr S. Heyworth who has not only given me the profit of his advice more than once on what I had written but also placed at my disposal his collations of the Poggian mss. and made available to me part of his unpublished Cambridge thesis. Without his collations chapter 2.2. could not have been written. Hardly any of my views on a major problem survived completely unaltered after his profound criticism, above all it is not possible to do full justice to what I owe to his unpublished work and I hope he will forgive me for plundering unashamedly the material he put at my disposal; it may, however, be worth pointing out explicitly that we have reached independently the conclusion that Propertius' second book is affected by major text losses which led to major dislocation and to the disappearance of book division between II. x and II. xiii. In an author like Propertius any such coincidence of opinion is certainly no matter of course.

Professors Luciano Canfora and Paolo Fedeli kindly discussed with me several problems during a most agreeable stay at Bari and made me think again hard about some of the solutions I had proposed to them. Professor Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones I thank, as always, for his continuous encouragement and for his precious support. The present study was written mainly during the two years I could stay in Venice as a Feodor-Lynen-scholar of the 'Alexander-von-Humboldt-Stiftung' (AvH); later my research was also supported by the 'Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft' (DFG). To both foundations I am deeply grateful for their financial support. But above all, heartfelt thanks must go once again to my friends in Venice, Professors Mario Cantilena, Paolo Eleuteri and, in particular, to Mario Geymonat who smoothed my path in many ways, invited me to lectures and seminars on Propertius and Augustan poetry in Venice and with the kind interest and generous encouragement characteristic of him contrib-

uted much to the progress of my work. For help with proofreading, with the indices and various other matters I thank Mrs Nicoletta Bonel, Mr Alfonso Colomer Prat, Ms Lorena De Faveri and Mrs Marina Molin Pradel.

Venice, August 1995 H.-C. G.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions and Commentaries of Propertius

A. Volscus, *Propertii elegiae, Ant. Volscus recognouit* (Rome 1482), *Tibull. c. comm. Bernardini Veronensis. Catull. c. comm. Ant. Parthenii et Propertius cum comm. Antonii Volsci* (Venice 1487-8)

Ph. Beroaldus, *Commentarii in Propertium a Phil. Beroaldo editi* (Bologna 1487, reprinted 1491, 1493, 1494, 1500, 1520 Venice)

M.A. Muret, *Catullus et in eum commentarius M. Antoni Mureti, ab eodem correcti et scholiis illustrati Tibullus et Propertius* (Venice 1558)

J.J. Scaliger, *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius. Noua editio. I. Scaliger recensuit. Eiusdem in eosdem castigationes liber* (Paris 1577, ^{2}Antwerp 1582, ^{3}Heidelberg 1600, ^{4}Leiden 1607, ^{5}1622)

J. Passerat, *I. Passeratii, Professoris et interpretis regii, commentarii in. C. Val. Catullum, A. Tibullum et Sex. Aur. Propertium cum tribus accuratissimis rerum, uerborum, auctorum et emendationum indicibus* (Paris 1608)

P. Burmann, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum libri IV. Cum commentario perpetuo Petri Burmanni Secundi et multis doctorum notis ineditis* (Utrecht 1780)

Ch. Th. Kuinoel, *Propertii carmina rec. et illustr. Ch. Theoph. Kuinoel* (Leipzig 1805)

K. Lachmann, *Sex. Aur. Propertii Carmina. Emendauit ad codicum meliorem fidem et annotauit C. Lachmannus* (Leipzig 1816); *Propertii elegiae ex recensione C. Lachmanni* (Berlin 1829)

F. Jacob, *Sex. Aurelii Propertii Carmina. Ad fidem optimorum codicum recensuit, integram Groningani, Neapolitani, excerptorum Puccii uarietatem lectionis breuemque adnotationem adiecit Fridericus Iacob* (Leipzig 1827)

W.A.B. Hertzberg, *Sex. Aur. Propertii elegiarum libri quattuor. Codicibus partim denuo collatis, partim nunc primum excussis recensuit, librorum mss. Groningani, Guelferbytani, Hamburgensis, Dresdensis, Vossiani, Heinsiani, editoris Regiensis, excerptorum Pucii, exemplaris Perreiani discrepantias integras addidit, quaestionum Propertianarum libris tribus et commentariis illustrauit G.A.B. Hertzberg* (Halle 1843-5)

H. Keil, *Sex. Propertii elegiae. Edidit Henricus Keil* (Leipzig 1850, ^{2}1867)

F.A. Paley, *The Elegies of Propertius, with English Notes by F.A. Paley* (London 1853, ^{2}1872)

M. Haupt, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina a Maur. Hauptio recognita* (Leipzig 1853, ^{2}1861, ^{3}1868)

D. Carutti, *Sex. Aur. Propertii Cynthia cum libro quarto elegiarum, qui Propertii nomine fertur. Editio nouum in ordinem digesta recensente D. Carutti* (The Hague 1869)

L. Müller, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii Carmina. Accedunt Laeuii Calui Cinnae aliorum reliquiae et Priapea. Recensuit et praefatus est Lucianus Mueller* (Leipzig 1870)

Ae. Baehrens, *Sexti Propertii elegiarum libri IV. Recensuit Ae. Baehrens* (Leipzig 1880)

A. Palmer, *Sexti Propertii elegiarum libri IV. Recensuit A. Palmer* (London—Dublin 1880)

J.P. Postgate, *Select Elegies of Propertius.Edited with Introduction, Notes and Appendices by John Percival Postgate* (London 1881, ²1885), *Sexti Properti carmina recognouit Iohannes Percival Postgate* (London 1894)

M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sex. Propertius. Erklärt von M. Rothstein* (Berlin 1898, ²1920-24)

J.S. Phillimore, *Propertii carmina recognouit breuique adnotatione critica instruxit I.S. Phillimore* (Oxford 1901), *Propertius. Carmina recogn. breuique adnotatione critica instruxit J.S. Phillimore* (Oxford 1946)

O.L. Richmond, *Sex. Propertii quae supersunt opera edidit nouoque apparatu critico instruxit O.L. Richmond* (Cambridge 1928)

S.G. Tremenheere, *The Elegies of Propertius, in a Reconditioned Text with a Rendering in Vers and Commentary by S.G. Tremenheere* (London 1931)

H.E. Butler-E.A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius Ed. with an Introduction and Commentary by H.E. Butler and E.A. Barber* (Oxford 1933)

J.P. Enk, *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos) ed. P.J. Enk* (Leiden 1946)

E.A. Barber, *Propertii carmina recogn. breuique adnotatione critica instruxit E.A. Barber* (Oxford 1953, ²1960)

W.A. Camps, *Propertius. Elegies. Book I-IV, ed. by W.A. Camps* (Cambridge I: 1961; II: 1967; III: 1966; IV: 1965)

J.P. Enk, *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber II ed. P. J. Enk* (Leiden 1962)

P. Fedeli, *Properzio. Elegie. Libro IV, testo critico e commento a cura di P. Fedeli* (Bari 1965)

L. Richardson, *Propertius. Elegies I-IV. Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, by L. Richardson, Jr.* (Oklahoma 1976)

G.C. Giardina, *Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber II, ed. breui commentario instruxit I.C. Giardina* (Turin 1977)

R. Hanslik, *Sex. Propertii elegiarum libri IV edidit R. Hanslik* (Leipzig 1979)

P. Fedeli, *Sesto Properzio. Il primo libro delle elegie. Introduzione, testo critico e commento a cura di P. Fedeli* (Florence 1980)

id., *Sex. Properti Elegiarum Libri IV edidit P. Fedeli* (Stuttgart 1984)

id., *Properzio. Il libro terzo delle elegie. Introduzione testo e commento di P. Fedeli* (Bari 1985)

G.P. Goold, *Propertius. Elegies. Edited and translated by G.P. Goold* (Cambridge Mass.—London 1990)

Literature Cited in Abbreviation

Abel = W. Abel, *Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern* (Diss. Berlin 1930)

APN = R.D. Anderson, P.J. Parsons, R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrîm', *JRS* 69 (1979), 125-155

Bailey = *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex, ed. with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Translation, and Commentary by C. Bailey* (Oxford 1947)

Boter = G. Boter, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic, Mnemosyne* Suppl. 107 (Leiden 1989)

Boucher = J.-P. Boucher, *Etudes sur Properce, Problèmes d' inspiration et d' art* (Paris 1965)

Butrica = J.L. Butrica, *The Ms. Tradition of Propertius, Phoenix* Suppl. 17 (Toronto 1984)

Cameron = A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993)

Courtney 1 = E. Courtney, 'The structure of Propertius book I and some textual consequences', *Phoenix* 22 (1968), 250-258

Courtney 2 = 'A Miscellany on Latin Poetry', *BICS* 29 (1982), 49-54

Courtney 3 = 'Quotation, interpolation, transposition', *Hermathena* 143 (1987), 7-18

Davis = J.T. Davis, *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid, Noctes Romanae* 15 (Berne 1977)

Dilke = *Statius Achilleid ed. O.A.W. Dilke* (Cambridge 1954)

Dörrie = H. Dörrie, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum Teil I*, Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen I, Phil.-hist. Klasse Jahrgang 1960 Nr. 5; *Teil III*, Jahrgang 1972 Nr. 6

Ehlers = W.W. Ehlers, *Untersuchungen zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Argonautica des C. Valerius Flaccus*, Zetemata 52 (München 1970)

Fraenkel = E. Fraenkel, review of Housman's edition of Lucan in *Gnomon* 2 (1926), 497-532 = *Kleine Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* II (Rome 1964), 267-308²

GMAW = E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 2nd ed. revised and enlarged by P.J. Parsons, *BICS* Suppl. 46 (1987)
Goold 1 = G.P. Goold, 'Noctes Propertianae', *HSCP* 71 (1967), 59-106
Goold 2 = 'On Editing Propertius', *Papers in Honour of Otto Skutsch*, *BICS* Suppl. 51 (1987), 27-38
Goold 3 = 'Problems in Editing Propertius', in: J.N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York 1989), 97-119
Goold 4 = 'Paralipomena Propertiana', *HSCP* 95 (1992), 287-320

Günther 1 = H.-C. Günther, 'Textprobleme im Prolog der Aulischen Iphigenie des Euripides', *WJbb* 13 (1987)
Günther 2 = H.-C. Günther, *Exercitationes Sophocleae, Hypomnemata* 109 (Göttingen 1994)

Hall, *DRP* = *Claudian, De Raptu Proserpinae* ed. J.B. Hall (Cambridge 1969)
Hall, *Prolegomena* = J.B. Hall, *Prolegomena to Claudian, BICS* Suppl. 45 (1986)
Haupt = M. Haupt, 'Ueber J. Scaliger und die von Haase vorgeschlagene Umstellung Tibullischer Versreihen', in: M. Haupt, *Opuscula* III, 2 (Leipzig 1876), 30-41
Heyworth 1 = S.J. Heyworth, 'Notes on Propertius Books I and II', *CQ* 34 (1984), 394-405
Heyworth 2 = S.J. Heyworth, review of Butrica in: *CR* 36 (1986), 45-48
Heyworth 3 = S.J. Heyworth, 'Notes on Propertius, Books III and IV', *CQ* 36 (1986), 199-211
Housman = *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman* (Cambridge 1972)
Hubbard = M. Hubbard, *Propertius* (London 1974)

Ites = M. Ites, *De Propertii elegiis inter se conexis* (Diss. Göttingen 1908)

Jachmann 1 = G. Jachmann, 'Binneninterpolation', *NGG* (1934-36), 123-144, 185-215 (= *Textgeschichtliche Studien, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 143 [Königstein 1982], 528-549, 550-580)
Jachmann 2 = G. Jachmann, 'Calabrae Pierides', *Philologus* 90 (1939), 331-351 (*Ausgewählte Schriften, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 128 [Königstein 1981], 420-440)
Jachmann 3 = G. Jachmann, 'Eine Studie zu Properz', *Festschrift F. Schulz* (Weimar 1951) II, 179-187 (= *Ausgewählte Schriften* 411-419)
Jachmann 4 = G. Jachmann, 'Zur Frage der Verswiederholung in der Augusteischen Dichtung', in *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli*, Firenze 1955, 393-421 (= *Ausgewählte Schriften* 441-469)

Jacoby = F. Jacoby, 'Drei Gedichte des Properz', *RhM* 69 (1914), 393-413, 427-463 (= *Kleine Philologische Schriften* II [Berlin 1961], 216-265)

Keller = O. Keller, *Epilegomena zu Horaz* (Leipzig 1879-80)

Knoche 1 = U. Knoche, 'Zur Frage der Properzinterpolation', *RhM* 85 (1936), 8-63

Knoche 2 = U. Knoche, review of Butler-Barber's edition of Propertius in: *Gnomon* 12 (1936), 260-272

Knoche 3 = U. Knoche, 'Gedanken und Vorschläge zur Interpretation von Properzens Gedicht 2, 28', *Atti dell' Accademia Properziana del Subasio*, Serie V, N. 5 (Assisi 1957), 49-70 = *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften* (Frankfurt 1986), 314-335

La Penna = A. La Penna, review of Butrica, *The Ms. Tradition of Propertius* in: *Gnomon* 61 (1989), 118-12

Lefèvre = E. Lefèvre, 'La struttura dell' elegia properziana' in: *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi properziani Roma-Assisi, 21-26 maggio 1985* (Assisi 1986), 143-154

Lindsay = W.M. Lindsay, *Ancient Editions of Martial* (Oxford 1903)

Lowe = E.A. Lowe, *Paleographical Papers* (Oxford 1972)

Luck 1 = G. Luck, *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids* (Heidelberg 1969)

Luck 2 = G. Luck, 'Die fehlenden Verse im Lucantext', *RhM* 112 (1969), 254-284

Ludwich = A. Ludwich (ed.), *Die Homerische Batrachomachia* (Leipzig 1896)

Murgia = C.E. Murgia, 'Propertius 4.1.87-88 and the Division of 4.1', *HSCP* 92 (1989), 257-272

Shackleton Bailey 1 = D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 'Some recent Experiments in Propertian Criticism', *PCPhS* NS 2 (1952-53), 9-20

Shackleton Bailey 2 = D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1956)

Skutsch 1 = O. Skutsch, 'The structure of the Propertian "Monobiblos"', *CPh* 58 (1963), 238-9

Skutsch 2 = O. Skutsch, 'The second book of Propertius', *HSCP* 79 (1975), 229-233

Smyth = W.R. Smyth, *Thesaurus criticus ad Sexti Propertii textum*, *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 12 (Leiden 1970)

Stout = S.E. Stout, *Scribe and Critic at Work in Pliny's Letters* (Bloomington 1954)

Tarrant = R.T. Tarrant, 'The Reader as Author: Collaborative Interpolation in Latin Poetry', in: J.N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts* (New York 1989), 121-162

Tränkle 1 = H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache, Hermes-Einzelschriften* 15 (Wiesbaden1960)

Tränkle 2 = H. Tränkle, review of Enk (II) in: *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 692-701

TT = L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford 1983)

Willis = J. Willis, *Latin Textual Criticism* (Urbana—Chicago—London 1972)

Zwierlein = O. Zwierlein, *Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Ausgabe der Tragödien Senecas, Abh. der Akad. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit. Mainz*, Jahrgang 1983, Nr. 3

SIGLA

A	=	Leid. Voss. 38
C	=	Rom. Casan. 15
F	=	Laur. 36, 49
J	=	Parm. Pal. 140
K	=	Vratisl. Univ. Akc. 1948 KN 197
L	=	Bodl. Holkh. 333
Λ	=	consensus codicum CJKMRSTUW
M	=	Par. lat. 8233
N	=	Guelferb. Gud. 224
P	=	Par. lat. 7989
Π	=	Petrarcae exemplar, fons codicum FLPZ
R	=	Bodmer. 141
S	=	Monac. Cim. 22
T	=	Vat. lat. 3273
U	=	Vat. Urb. lat. 641
W	=	Vat. Cappon. 196
Z	=	Marc. Z. lat. 443

CHAPTER ONE

TRANSPOSITION

1.1 *Verse Transpositions in Propertius and the Transmission of the Second Book*

Verse transpositions have been the scandal of Propertian criticism ever since the excesses of Richmond's edition, which was derided as the author's 'Phantasieproperz' by its most distinguished reviewer.[1] After this débâcle editors have tended to shy away from exposing their reputation by adopting a practice of radical criticism more in accord with the unrestrained ingenuity of the dilettante than with the rigid methodology of the professional scholar. Nevertheless, not only can such an approach to the admittedly exceptional problems of the text of Propertius claim a noble lineage which goes back to a figure as venerable as J.J. Scaliger:[2] it is certainly anything but piety if some of

---

[1] See Felix Jacoby in rev.: Richmond, *Sexti Properti quae supersunt opera*, *Gnomon* 6 (1930), 104. It is, however, fair to say that the overall disaster of Richmond's edition has unjustly obscured his merits, which are considerable. With his often very clever emendations he was possibly (in some cases even certainly) right in I. xvii. 3, xix. 19, xx. 7, II. xxv. 35, xxviii. 11, xxxii. 5, III. iv. 16-20, IV. iv. 15, 73, viii. 12, ix. 70, x. 43, xi. 8. I would accept his transposition of II. viii. 25-26 after 20 (cf. p. 49), and he was surely right on IV. i. 83-86 (see below p. 51). Moreover, Richmond was the first to see that the original book III began with II. xiii (see below p. 9ff.) and that III. xi. 58 (omitted in N) is probably spurious (see below p. 9). Cf. also Butrica 9f.

[2] Scholars were never at ease judging Scaliger's work on the Roman elegists; "...sed malo accidit fato ut vir magnus I.I. Scaliger, qui primus hanc opem tulit, noceret multo magis quam adiuvaret. Nam cum manu audacissima eademque minime dextra plurimas carminum particulas sede sua evulsas in alium locum migrare iuberet, quid aliud consecutus est quam ut hoc genus emendandi omne infamaret et criticis cetera cordatis suspectum redderet?" This was Baehrens's (p. xv) judgement on Scaliger's Propertius, and already before him M. Haupt expressed a hardly kinder view on Scaliger's transpositions (but note also the more balanced words of Ritschl, *Opuscula philologica* iii [Leipzig 1877], 616f.). A. Grafton in his monograph on Scaliger (*Joseph Justus Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* [Oxford 1983], 176ff.) takes a more sympathetic view; his few remarks on Scaliger as an editor of the Roman elegists have the merit of pointing out the historical background of Scaliger's editorial technique (cf. by the same author, 'Joseph Scaliger's Edition of Catullus (1577) and the Traditions of Textual Criticism in the Renaissance, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 38 (1975), 155ff. and E.J. Kenney, *The Classical Text. Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book*, *Sather Classical Lectures* 44 (1974), 54ff.). One may note, however, the well deserved tribute of Butler-Barber (*ad loc.*) on Scaliger's rearrangement of II. ii and iii ("... a tribute of admiration is due to Scaliger's ingenious rearrangement of this and the following elegy"); in fact, on closer inspection Scaliger's transpositions always show a remarkable perceptiveness for the

the bolder transpositions of Housman or others are still seriously discussed in modern commentaries and have found a place in the apparatuses of most major editions. Indeed, even after the downfall of Richmond's speculations scholars have never completely ceased to propose now and then new radical transpositions, and at least one of these appeared to be attractive enough to persuade at one time even a rather conservative critic like Enk.[3] More recently Goold in various contributions has done much to revive the method. He even ventured to incorporate a series of radical transpositions in his Loeb edition and to some extent such audacity was already anticipated by Richardson.

But in spite of the sympathies which some modern editors and commentators may feel from time to time for major transpositions, few today would go as far as Goold or Richardson and incorporate anything of this sort in their text. Most would no doubt regard as an insurmountable obstacle the methodological *caveat*, put magisterially by Butler-Barber[4] in the preface to their edition: "with regard to the drastic remedy of wholesale transposition ... it cannot be justified until some reasoned explanation is forthcoming. That elegiac couplets may

---

problems of the text and often present the best result which can be achieved by transposition alone without assuming lacunae.

It should also be pointed out that Scaliger's merits as a conjectural critic in Propertius can hardly be overestimated. The judgement expressed by Goodyear on Scaliger's prior edition of the *Appendix Vergiliana* can be even more deservedly applied to his Propertius: "It was genius indeed which, faced with a text of g, could produce at least a score of conjectures which should stand in any text today, in several passages restoring the readings later found in G and C, and as many more which claim a place in any critical apparatus"; for Scaliger's ms. basis for Propertius cf. A. Palmer, 'Scaliger's Liber Cujacianus of Propertius, Catullus, etc.', *Hermathena* 2 (1876), 124-134 (the ms., Egerton 3027, written 1467 by Pacificus Maximus Irenaeus of Ascoli [see Butrica 246f.] is cited under the siglum τ in Hanslik's apparatus). I regard 28 of Scaliger's emendations in Propertius as correct, a success rate hardly rivaled by any other scholar: I. xi. 11: Teuthrantis (teutrantis *iam* V^2)]: teutantis, I. xiii. 24: ab Oetaeis] in (a)etheis, II. i. 53: Iolciacis] colch-, II. x. 22: his] hac, II. xviii. 10: abiunctos] aduinctos, II. xx. 8: depluit] defluit, II. xxv. 2: excludi] excludit, II. xxviii. 54: Thebae] phoebi, II. xxxii. 40: Nai caduca] naica dona, III. ii. 13: Phaeacas] phaeacias, III. iii. 33 iura] rura), III. iii. 42: flare (*iam Fruter*)] : flere, III. viii. 11: rabida] grauida, III. xi. 62: Decius admisso] at D- misso, III. xiii. 35: hinulei] atque hunili sive humili, III. xvii. 24: rapta] grata, III. xviii. 2: fumida] humida, III. xxi. 8: amicta] amica, IV. vi. 3: serta ... certent] cera ... certet, IV. vi. 45: proh] prope, IV. vi. 72: blanditaeque [*iam Par. 8459*] : blanditiaeque), IV. ix. 34: fana] uana. In five other places Scaliger correctly restored the short third person plural perfect (I. xi. 11, 29, II. viii. 10, III. xi. 65, IV. vii. 15, viii. 54). In six further cases Scaliger adopted for the first time the true reading from τ (I. v. 8, x. 28, xvi. 23, II. xiii. 55, III. xxii. 28, IV. viii. 37.

[3] See below p. 20 n. 67.

[4] Pp. lxix f. Cf. also Shackleton Bailey 1, 10f.; Willis 151ff.

easily be displaced is an admissible view ... But that a couplet or a series of couplets should stray far afield ... is incredible in default of some definite theory ... Further, it may be added that in the case of less wholesale transpositions the improvement secured by such transference is not in the majority of instances sufficient to justify this method. Transpositions to be justified must do more than give a slight improvement; they must be absolutely convincing, if they are to be embodied in the text."

I do not pretend to be able fully to meet the demands placed upon the advocates of transposition by the authors of what is still the best full-scale commentary on Propertius. As far as absolute conviction is concerned, one may feel, especially in our days, that a statement as blunt as that cited above is suited to disguise the inevitable element of subjectivity in judgements of poetic style and diction rather than to alert scholars to the dangers of undisciplined speculation. One might prefer to say that there are various degrees of conviction a particular emendation of the transmitted text will carry and various degrees of probability that go with it; whether to put an emendation of any kind into the printed text must, alas, all too often be left to the discretion of the editor and will often depend on the aims of his edition. Of course, the degree of probability of any alteration of the transmitted text also depends on whether a plausible explanation of the process of corruption can be detected. To be sure, that diagnosis of corruption should count for more than attempts to explain the process has often been stated, also in respect of verse transpositions in the Roman elegists and not only by radical critics like Goold.[5] Nevertheless it seems worthwhile to try to go at least some way towards answering Butler-Barber's demand for a rationale of how, in a limited number of places, dislocations of longer passages could have affected the archetype of our tradition.

If we wish to form a picture about the condition of the text of Propertius' second book, we do best to start with two problems which still loom large in modern discussions of textual matters in this author. First of all we have to confront the notorious question of poem division. This problem would have been discussed with more profit if scholars had always been fully aware of a few basic facts of the transmission. That there is a considerable discrepancy as to poem divisions in the medieval tradition has been pointed out repeatedly,[6] and

---

[5] Goold 1. 96f. Courtney (2, 16) was equally dismissive. Cf. also Haupt's (38) remarks on a major transposition in Tibullus: "... es ist verkehrt, wenn man überall verderbnisse nicht nur heilen, sondern auch erklären will. das richtige hat gesetz und regel; irrungen sind oft durch wunderlichen und unerkennbaren zufall verursacht."

[6] See Knoche 3, 52f.; 2, 266; Boucher 338; cf. also Butler-Barber p. lxviii.

Propertius is not, of course, the only author in whose work such divergence can be observed.[7] Yet the degree of variation in Propertius is particularly high, especially in the notorious second book, and this fact alone is sufficient to cast serious doubt on the integrity of the transmission.[8]

The problem can however be taken further if we reflect for a moment on how the divisions of a text into independent poems were marked in a book of the Augustan age and how these divisions were handled in the course of transmission. We possess indeed with the famous Gallus papyrus a fragment of a book of this period,[9] where poems (in this case epigrams) are divided clearly by *spatium* and a graphical sign.[10] Unfortunately there is not much other evidence for

---

[7] Problems similar to those in Propertius are encountered on a smaller scale in the text of Catullus; see below p. 5 n. 12, p. 13 n. 40 and p. 14 n. 41. On Horace see Keller 177, on Ovid Luck 1, 90ff., and below p. 14 n. 41; cf. also Tib. III. vi. 33. For cases of omitted divisions in Martial I cite only IX. lviii/lxix, lix/lx, ci/cii (not separated in γ; cf. also Friedländer [Leipzig 1886], 103). Lindsay (53) has shown that false poem divisions had already entered the text before 400 and were corrected in α and γ.

Poem divisions missing in the Z—family of Ausonius may easily be seen in R. Peiper's list ('Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung des Ausonius', *JbbclPh* Suppl. 11 (1880), 194f.). For Greek examples cf. e.g. *Anth. Gr.* V. lxxxiii and lxxxiv (not divided in Marc. gr. 481); V. ix is presented as two separate pieces (ll. 1-2 and 3-8) in two different places by Planudes.

[8] In his unpublished dissertation Heyworth has undertaken a careful study of poem divisions and titles in N, Π and Λ, which I hope he will publish eventually. He notes thirty-four cases of dissense between the relevant mss. (not counting marginal divisions), and the following figures are taken from Heyworth; the mss. in brackets are those in error. There are four cases in book I: xvii. (T), xviii (T), xxi (ATSKWJC), xxii (N); fourteen cases in book II: i. 78/ ii (N), v (NΠ), vi (N), x (Π), xi (Π), xix (S), xx (Π), xxiv (LPKWJ), xxvi. 29 (NMURC), xxvii (Λ), xxviii. 35 (NMURC), xxix (F), xxx (ΠSKWJ), xxxiii (N); eight cases in book III: vii (PC), viii (FLKWJ), xi. 17 (FMUR), 21 (PSKWJ), 39 (ΠKWJMUR), xiv (N), xv. 10 (NΠ), xxv (NΛ, cont. P recte, see below p. ooo n. ooo); seven cases in book IV: vi (NΠSKWJMUR), vi. 11 (ΠΛ), viii (N), viii. 29 (ΠΛ), ix (N), x (N), xi (N).

Among the many cases where all mss. wrongly fail to divide poems in book II (see below p. 14 n. 41)—as opposed to only two cases in the first (viii A/B and xi/xii) and in the fourth book (v/vi and i A/B (see below p. 130f.)—there are two which have not affected the standard numbering, because division had already been introduced by Italian humanists (II. xxxiv, IV. vi, to which add I. xii divided by N[2]). On the other side the incorrect division by humanists between II. xxxi and xxxii has equally found its way into our editions (like N's faulty division of III. xxv). An incorrect division common to all relevant mss. can be seen after II.vii.12 (see Butrica 81). For the transmitted division between I. iv and v see below p. 48, for that between III. i and ii p. 146 n. 62.

[9] *Ed. princ.* = APN.

[10] See P. J. Parsons in APN 129-131. That no poem division is implied by the arrangement of the papyrus, as has been argued by C. I. Newman ('De novo Galli Fragmento in Nubia eruto', *Latinitas* 28,2 (1980), 83-91), is extremely unlikely; cf. also

early Latin books, but if we turn to the Greek world, where the documentation is better, it becomes extremely dubious if there were any binding conventions about how to mark the division of a text into single poems. Certainly *spatium* was not a prerequisite of these divisions, as is shown by many Greek papyri which mark the beginning of a poem in various ways in the margin only,[11] and indeed this practice continues even in medieval mss.[12] We possess a Greek papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 3324) of approximately the same date as the Gallus papyrus, presenting epigrams of Meleager without division by *spatium*. Indeed, *paragraphos* without *spatium* appears to have been quite common as a divider of a text into single poems, as well as of larger poems or works of prose into sections, so that no clear distinction exists between the division into independent poems or into sections of a continuous book.[13] The evidence clearly suggests that poem division was a feature of the ancient book which was handled as arbitrarily and casu-

---

S. J. Heyworth ('A note on the Gallus fragment', *LCM* 9.4 (1984), 63f.) who even suggests that we are dealing with three scattered fragments from an anthology (similarly E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* [Oxford 1993], p. 264). His arguments are valid as regards his refutation of the unitarian view but he does nothing to show that the pieces cannot stand as three separate epigrams (Courtney *loc. cit.* states that 2-5 do not look self-contained but gives no reason). On the contrary, the thematic connections and the pseudo-dramatic development from l. 1 to l. 2, inept as it would be in a single poem, very well suits the book arrangement and has its antecedents in Hellenistic collections of epigrams (see below p. 12; cf. also APN 149). It would be strange if so neat an arrangement would have come across by chance in an anthology. Courtney's (p. 267) contention that 8f. appear to be written later than 2-5 is not cogent. I agree with him that 2-5 more probably refer to Julius Caesar than to Octavian but this is not entirely certain and I see no reason why 8f. must be dependent of Verg. *ecl.* ii. 25.

11 E.g. by *paragraphos* or *ekthesis* (^{2}*GMAW* p. 8); neither *coronis* (^{2}*GMAW* p. 12) nor even the *asteriskos* must necessarily go together with *spatium* (see ^{2}*GMAW* p. 13 n. 62). On the evidence of the Gallus papyrus one may even suspect that enlarged initials as division markers may have a longer history in Latin books than one might otherwise have thought (for initials in Greek papyri see ^{2}*GMAW* p. 7, slightly enlarged initials are quite common in documents).
Poem titles may also be of ancient origin (cf. e.g. Lindsay 34 and the *praefatio* of his *OCT* of Martial p. xviii), and we already find titles written *in linea* in a papyrus of Theocritus (*P. Oxy.* 2064), datable to the second century A.D; cf. Gow (Cambridge ^{2}1952), lxxf. Normally however they were not regarded as an integral part of the *paradosis* and were added in the margin.

12 One need only think of the *Neapolitanus*, where examples can easily be verified in Birt's or Fedeli's facsimile (see also Butrica 25); cf. also W. Eisenhut, 'Zu Catull C. 2A und der Trennung der Gedichte in den Handschriften', *Philologus* 109 (1965), 301-5.

13 One may also note that the word ποίημα may be used for a single poem as well as for a section of a larger poem (see C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry* I (Cambridge 1963), 61ff., especially 62 n. 5), and the same is true of the Latin *carmen* (see *ThlL* s.v. I C).

ally as punctuation or the division of major works into paragraphs and chapters. The external indications of poem division were not only very likely to get lost, we cannot even assume that they were regarded as an integral part of the text which had to be copied regularly. The authority of our mss. as to poem division is not greater than as to punctuation or, say, the division of parts in dramatic texts.[14]

To be sure, correct poem division was easily discernible in most cases, particularly in books comprising poems in different metres, and consequently there was little scope for error in the course of the transmission. The high concentration of problematic divisions and, in consequence, the divergence of mss. in the second book of Propertius points to the singular condition of the text of this book, to which we shall turn our mind presently. In any case, the poem divisions of our mss. plainly have no authority for us and we are free to divide poems as we think fit, guided only by common sense and reason. There is no onus of proof whatsoever for the advocate of division which does not fall equally upon the believer in unity. This does not mean that division has to be introduced in every case where this is possible or indeed has been suggested; the cases where serious disagreement is possible are however comparatively few, and one may feel free to dispense with discussing interpretations designed only to preserve at all costs a phantom of the medieval tradition which has no foundation in the text of the ancient author.

Regardless of the textual difficulties in general which brought Propertius the reputation of being a particularly obscure and difficult author, it must be clear to every serious student of his poetry that the second book not only presents more problems than any other book from his pen but in particular problems of a kind encountered on a much smaller scale in the other books.[15] Since Lachmann's epoch-making edition[16] it had been customary to explain this special condition of the text of book II by the hypothesis that this book represents a conflation of two originally separate books preserved only in a fragmentary state. Not only did Lachmann's enormous reputation at first secure almost unanimous support for his theory; in the wake of

---

[14] See ²*GMAW* p. 9f. with n. 42. For the attribution of parts in texts of Latin drama see now Zwierlein 249ff. and id., 'Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus (II)', *WJbb* 4 (1978), 145ff.

[15] "In book ii at least we have to deal with something deeper and more serious than mere verbal corruption", Butler-Barber p. lxviii.

[16] Lachmann's early work on the elegist, understandably, has always largely remained in the shadow of his monumental Lucretius and much adverse judgement has been passed on his Propertius.

the rise of palaeographical studies in the late 19th century his suggestion was taken up by the author of a standard work on the ancient book, Theodor Birt, who tried to justify the division of the second book on external grounds.[17] But soon Birt's rather dogmatic interpretation of the available data was seriously challenged and with it also Lachmann's whole concept of the text.[18] Today we possess a great deal more material from the papyri than was known to Birt and certainly no one would venture to make definitive statements on the greatest possible length of a papyrus roll. Nevertheless, many of Birt's and indeed of Lachmann's arguments for the division of book II into two books are much better than most modern scholars have been willing to admit, and Lachmann's hypothesis has been justly revived by O. Skutsch[19] who in his admirable reassessment of Birt's conclusions has shown convincingly that Lachmann's view must be correct.

Lachmann's theory has gained further ground by Tränkle's[20] discovery of a major lacuna in our text between II. iii. and iv. It is unnecessary to repeat the reasons for Tränkle's lacuna, which has rightly found its place in the text of Hanslik's edition. One need only add that in view of what has been said above on the authority of the

---

17 *Das antike Buchwesen* (1882), 413ff., 'Bemerkungen zum „ersten Buche" des Properz', *RhM* 38 (1883), 197ff.; Birt later defended his view against subsequent criticism in 'Zur Monobiblos und zum Codex N des Properz', *RhM* 64 (1909), 393ff.

18 See especially E. Reisch, 'Properz-Studien I: Zur Chronologie der drei ersten Bücher. II: Das vierte Buch', *WS* 9 (1887), 94ff.; B. L. Ullman, 'The Book Division of Propertius', *CPh* 4 (1909), 45ff.; since then Lachmann's division has been unanimously rejected by editors; cf. e.g. Butler-Barber p. xxviii, Enk (I) p. 19ff.

19 See Skutsch 2; cf. also Hubbard 41; for an instructive survey of the previous discussion see Fedeli (I) pp. 11f. More recently E. P. Menes ('The External Evidence for the Division of Propertius, Book 2', *CPh* 78 (1983), 136-143) and G. O. Hutchinson ('Propertius and the Unity of the Book', *JRS* 74 [1984], 106 n. 52) have argued against Birt's assumption that book I circulated separately in antiquity under the title 'Monobiblos'. Their criticism was taken up by Heyworth in his unpublished dissertation; he denies that Martial's title *Monobiblos Properti* on xiv. 189 must refer to a separate edition of book I and suggests that the title 'Monobiblos' in A is the invention of Richard de Fournival who took it over from a copy of Martial. Consequently he reads *Propertius Elegiarum lib. IIII* with L^{ac} (III $L^{pc}GFH$) in Nonius' quotation of III. xxi. 14 (Nonius Marcellus ii p. 249 Lindsay). I do not think that the problem can be solved with much certainty, but I still feel there is a good chance that book I may have become known as 'Monobiblos' in contrast to the following two books which now form our book II and which appear to have been published together (see below p. 10 n. 30).

20 Tränkle 2, 697; Tränkle's lacuna between II. iii and iv was anticipated by Butler-Barber, who, discussing Schrader's connection of iii. 45ff. with iv (see below next note), complain about the lack of connection between the two passages and rightly point out the difficulties of beginning a poem with iv. 1. As regards the extension of the lacuna between iii and iv, it must surely comprise several distichs and is such as to suggest mechanical loss of text.

transmitted poem division one should not hesitate to start a new poem with II. iii. 45;[21] presumably we possess the first part of an elegy with II. iii. 45-54 and the end of another as well with II. iv. In any case, it seems that the full implications of Tränkle's findings have not yet been appreciated.

Lachmann thought that II. x was a fragment of the opening poem of his third book. Thus his division was intimately bound up with his theory about the fragmentary state of the text of book II, because II. i-ix are hardly sufficient to form a complete book on their own. For the full proof of Lachmann's theory Skutsch therefore rightly demanded evidence for major lacunae in the first nine poems of the book. Now, it is quite clear that Tränkle's lacuna between II. iii and iv must be of substantial length and most probably was caused by a purely mechanical loss of text, say, of one or more folia of a codex, and in it not only the end of iii. 45-54 and the beginning of iv but also a larger number of poems in between may have gone missing. Thus Tränkle's lacuna supplies exactly the evidence needed for II. i-ix to be able to stand as a whole book.

We are left then with the question whether Lachmann was right to regard II. x as the introductory poem of the third book.[22] There can hardly be any doubt that he found at least approximately the right place for division. The two poems II. viii and ix, expressing the poet's despair at the loss of his mistress to a rival, are indeed perfectly suited to close the cycle of elegies in much the same way as I. xvii-xix conclude the Cynthia poems of the *Monobiblos*. As in I. xvii-xix we

---

[21] Thus rightly Butler-Barber ("That a poem ends with 44 is clear") Giardina and Fedeli (for a similar opening cf. e.g. II. v); the division before iii. 45 is already in C (by a second hand) and was then suggested by Schrader, who connected iii. 45ff. with iv, and he has found favour with many editors (e.g. Rothstein, Enk and most recently Goold; see also the previous note). The connection with iv has been sufficiently refuted by Tränkle *loc. cit.* and Shackleton Bailey 67, but, as 41-44 make an excellent close for a poem (cf. the end of II. v, xxiv B, xxviii C, xxx B; also I. viii B, xviii) and 45f. fit equally well for the start of a new elegy, division is clearly preferable to regarding 45-54 as a lame appendix to iii. In 45 I agree with Shackleton Bailey that with *mihi* we need something like Lachmann's *hei* (or better L. Müller's *ei*, which is the better attested orthography) for the transmitted *aut* (not Pucci's facile *a(h)*, which hardly suits the following *si* -clause). Small words, not indispensable for the syntax, such as interjections, are often corrupted and certainty about the correct reading is often not attainable (for the proneness of the archetype of Propertius to omission of syllables and letters see below p. 113 n. 221). I only wish to mention in passing that perhaps Muret's *heu* (for *e*) in II. xii. 15 (surely the best solution) confirms Barbers *heu uano* in line 6 of the same poem as the two distichs 5f. and 15f. surely refer to each other.

[22] Lachmann thought the beginning of the poem was lost; this is possible in view of the fragmentary state of ix. 41-52 (see below) but by no means necessary, whether II. x does open a book or not.

find the poet resigned to the permanent loss of Cynthia culminating in the wish to die and the confession of eternal love beyond the grave.[23]

As to II. x it has been pointed out that this poem would stand rather isolated between purely erotic poems in the middle of a book, but we must ask ourselves whether this means that it must be the opening poem of a book or whether it could not stand equally well or better towards the end of a book as a kind of appendix to the erotic cycle. What appears to speak decisively against beginning a book with II. x is the farewell to love-poetry on Cynthia in lines 7f.[24] which is reaffirmed in the following epigram II. xi.[25] It seems, to my mind, impossible that II. xi should be placed towards the beginning of a book of erotic poems on Cynthia, and even II. xii, falling somehow outside of personal love poetry, seems not particularly well suited for an early position in the book. This amounts to saying that II. x-xii are appropriate not to the beginning but rather to the end of a book of love poetry.

In fact with II. xiii we encounter a second programmatic poem in close vicinity of x and indeed not II. x but rather II. xiii bears all the signs of being the introductory poem of book III. It is surprising that only recently does this view seems to have been gathering wider support.[26] II. xiii shows a sequence of thought closely related to the

---

[23] For parallels cf. the poet looking back to the past in I. xviii 5f., 11-8, 23-6 with II. viii 11-6 (also ix. 23-8), his fears of Cynthia neglecting his memory in I. xix. 3f., 21f. with II. viii. 19f., his protestations of love I. xviii. 19-22 and xix. 5f. with II. ix. 41-6. In passing I mention that Butler-Barber are entirely wrong in saying that in I. xix "the lovers are now reconciled"; the best interpretation of the poem is Richardson's introduction.

[24] *aetas prima canat Veneres, extrema tumultus; / bella canam, quando scripta puella mea est.*

[25] II. xi has often been regarded as a fragment (thus only recently Goold in his edition: "...these verses lack the focus necessary for an epigram and must be the fragment of a larger whole"; cf. also p. 17). In view of the fragmentary state of the text of book II this is possible but by no means necessary. In any case the analogy with book I, pointed out below, rather speaks in favour of regarding xi as an epigram, even if one or two couplets at the beginning of the poem have been lost. For Heyworth's view that the poem is dislocated see below.

[26] Already Richmond began his book III with II. xiii. More recently J. K. King ('Propertius 2. 1 - 12: His Callimachean Second Libellus', *WJbb* 6b (1980), 61ff.) has argued for regarding II. i-xii as Propertius' original book II. A convincing case for regarding II. xiii as the beginning of the original book III and II. x as the conclusion of book II has been made by Heyworth in his unpublished dissertation. As we have reached similar conclusions independently and it is not possible to do full justice to his unpublished work here I present my arguments almost as I had put them before knowing of Heyworth's thesis. I hope that he will publish his material in one or other form because it will strengthen our common case decidedly. In the meantime cf. his contribution in 'Propertius 2. 13', *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992), 45-59. For possible parallels between II. xiii and the introductory poem of a book of Gallus, see also APN 150f.

introduction of book II, II. i[27]: first a defence of the poet's choice to write love poetry and nothing else, founded in the poet's personal choice of βίος; this evokes the picture of the poet's life with the woman he loves and who is the inspiration of his poetry, a theme which is complemented by a second part about the poet's death in love and his eternal fame as an erotic poet.[28] One only needs to think how well the reference to a life's work of three books in xiii. 25 fits into such an introduction of the third book[29] to dispel the last doubt about the character of this poem. The major difference between II. i and xiii is that in II. xiii the accent is placed upon the poet's chosen βίος, and the rejection of high poetry is treated more summarily, presumably because literary aspects had been treated in II. x, standing in close vicinity to II. xiii at the end of the preceding book with which book III was published together.[30]

A programmatic poem like II. x is as suited for the end of a book as it is for the beginning. We only need to think of II. xxxiv; indeed, our two contemporary books II. i-xii and II. xiii-xxxiv both begin and end with programmatic poems which appear to complement each other. Thus not even the connection which certainly does exist be-

---

[27] Both II. i and II. xiii have been divided by some critics (i. 47-56 and 57- 78 were cut off by O. Ribbeck, 'Zur Erklärung und Kritik des Properz', *RhM* 40 [1885], 488; xiii. 1-16 were divided from the rest already by Broekhuizen and Hemsterhuis and this division was approved e.g. by Butler-Barber, Barber and Fedeli). I trust the brief analysis below makes clear why I regard both poems as a unity.

[28] Note especially the verbal reminiscences of II. i. 71 (*quandocumque igitur vitam mea fata reposcent*) in II. xiii. 17 (*quandocumque igitur nostros mors claudet ocellos*). For the tradition of the death motif as a variation of the motif of old age in Callimachus' literary polemics see W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960), 16, cf. also 41 n. 1.

[29] The awkwardness of all attempts to explain the reference to *tres libelli* in xiii. 25 in a poem of the second book (for a summary see Enk [II] p. 19ff.) has rightly been pointed out by Skutsch 2, 232. A similar reference to the book number is found in II. iii. 4 (*et turpis de te iam liber alter erit*) towards the beginning of book II, and, of course, in the famous verse opening the *Monobiblos*: *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis* (I. i. 1); this verse does not mean anything but that this is the poet's first attempt to write love poetry, just as the beginning of Horace's *C.* IV. i. 1 (*intermissa Venus diu rursus bella moves*) announces that old Horace is writing love poetry again (cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* [Oxford 1957], 413). The reference to one previous book in II. xxiv. 2 does not contradict the assumption that this poem stood in the third book, because the two books now forming book II were published together; see the following note.

[30] Poems in both parts of our book II refer to events between 28 and 24 B.C. (see Butler-Barber xxvf.); the earliest is II. xxxi from the part originally forming book III. That the books were published together is also suggested by the reference to the *Monobiblos* only in II. xxiv. 1f.
Alternatively Heyworth suggests that II. xxiv and xxxi may be dislocated and belong into the original book II. He points out that II. xiii. 1 - xxxiv. 94 already count 952 verses, and obviously the many lacunae suggest that the book originally was much longer. Nonetheless I see no compelling reason for this assumption.

tween II. x, or if you like II. x-xii, and II. xiii tells against the assumption that II. xiii opens a new book. In other introductory poems like the opening cycle II. i-iii or in III. i Propertius also refers back to the end of the previous book. The explanation in II. i-iii why the poet turns to love poetry again points back to the end of his affair with Cynthia in I. xvii-xix, that is to his farewell to love poetry. The death motif in II.i can be regarded as a complement to this motif in I. xvii-xix, just as in II. xiii it complements the sinister reflections of II. viii-ix. Beside this one may regard II. xiii. 3-4[31] as answering II. x. 25-6[32] in very much the same way as III. i. 1ff.[33] refers to II. xxxiv. 31ff.[34]

But if II. x perfectly suits the end of a book, what about II. xi and xii? Perhaps we need not assume necessarily that II. x must be the last poem of the book; it cannot be excluded that a programmatic statement was located close to the end. But can II. xi and xii plausibly be regarded as the concluding poems of a book, a kind of appendix after II. x? As Professor Fedeli rightly points out to me, comparing the concluding poems of books I, II and III, we expect a meaningful closure such as the sphragis of book I, the poetological elegy II. xxxiv or the renouncement of Cynthia in III. xxiv/xxv. II. xi may approach these criteria but it is surely difficult to accept II. xii as the last poem of a book. Therefore Heyworth in his unpublished dissertation suggests to end book II with II x and regard II. xi and xii as dislocated.[35] He may well be right. Nevertheless I think for all the difficulties which certainly do exist it is not wholly impossible to defend II. xi and II. xii as the concluding poems of the original book II.

Again there is a certain analogy with book I. Like I. xx-xxii the three poems II. x-xii form an appendix of three pieces different in form or content from the erotic cycle. In book I we find a little epyllion on Hercules and Hylas in elegiac metre and two non-erotic epigrams. II. x-xii present one non-erotic poem followed by an erotic epigram and another erotic poem which is not addressed to Cynthia and which clearly draws upon epigrammatic models and could, in spite of its greater length, be called an epigram as well.

Certainly, the parallel between books I and II is not perfect. In book I the appended epigrams are different in form and content, and,

---

[31] *hic* (sc. *Amor*) *me tam gracilis vetuit contemnere Musas,/ iussit et Ascraeum sic habitare nemus.*

[32] *nondum etiam Ascraeos norunt mea carmina fontis,/ sed modo Permessi flumine lavit Amor.*

[33] *Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,/ in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus (1-2); dicite, quo pariter carmen tenuastis in antro* (5).

[34] *tu +satius memorem Musis imitere Philitan* + (an *tenues Musas i- Philitae* ?) / *et non inflati somnia Callimachi* (31-2); *incipe iam angusto versus includere torno* (43).

[35] See Goold in the preface to his Loeb edition (p. 17).

as I have already said, I. xxii has the character of a sphragis whereas II. xii does not show any sign of being the concluding poem of a book. But if II. xii lacks any indications of book closure II. xi certainly stands well towards the end of a book, and a certain degree of analogy between the ends of book I and II as assumed by me cannot be overlooked. Moreover, the custom to end an elegy book with epigrammatic units may well be traditional.

It can be surmised that in the Alexandrine editions of classical poets whose work comprised *inter alia* some epigrams these had to be appended at the end of a book of poems of a different genre, as the epigrams alone could hardly ever form a book for themselves.[36] The same procedure may have been applied in editions of the *opera omnia* of the Hellenistic masters of Roman elegists such as Callimachus.[37] It is therefore hardly surprising if such a disposition is now attested with all probability for the elegy book of Gallus by the new papyrus.[38] Thematically the parallel between the Gallus papyrus and II. x-xi is particularly close. Like II. x the third epigram of the Gallus papyrus features a defence of the author's poetic programme. Even more significant is the observation that the second Gallus epigram presents the 'patriotic' theme linked to the preceding erotic cycle in a way similar to II. x, only that in the latter the two elements are integrated into the pattern of the Augustan *recusatio*.[39]

Whatever one may think of II. xi and xii we have established with a reasonable degree of certainty the division of what is now book II into two books. The running together of the two original books has

---

[36] See M.L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin-New York 1974), 20.

[37] To be sure from Hellenistic times on authors may have published whole books of epigrams (see P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* ii [Oxford 1972], 859 n. 405). But the small size of individual collections soon suggested collective publication (see Cameron 4). We do not know how the epigrams of poets who practised various genres were accommodated in complete editions. Callimachus' extant epigrams e.g. count 298 lines only (but, of course, we may not have them all), and it may be of interest to compare the Suda entry about the Latin translations of a certain Marianus which could suggest that in this edition (of course not in the original one) the epigrams were appended at the end of Aitia IV: μετάφραcιc Καλλιμάχου 'Εκάληc, ὕμνων καὶ τῶν Αἰτίων καὶ ἐπιγραμμάτων. If the epigrams formed a separate book one would perhaps rather expect: ... ὕμνων, (τῶν) Αἰτίων καὶ τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων.

[38] See APN 149f.

[39] Particularly significant is the juxtaposition of erotic despair and patriotic consolation as a development in time: *tristia nequit [ia ...] a Lycori tua*, followed by *fata mihi, Caesar, tum erunt mea dulcia* ... (Gallus col. i. 1-2); cf. with this the temporal adverbs in Prop. II. x (*iam* 2f., 11, 13, *nunc* 9f.). This technique of linking two separate epigrams foreshadows the arrangement of poems in a kind of dramatic order so characteristic of Roman elegy, in particular of Propertius (cf. G. Petersmann, *Themenführung und Motiventfaltung in der Monobiblos des Properz, Grazer Beiträge*, Suppl.-Bd. 1, 1980). Dramatic order of this sort does not, of course, exclude other types of arrangement,

obviously been caused by a considerable loss of text, at least in the first of the two books, a loss we were able to locate mainly between II. iii and iv.[40] This is however not the only place where this has hap-

which may be present in parallel, as e.g. the symmetric structure of the *Monobiblos* as demonstrated by Skutsch (=Skutsch 1 and below p. 140). The structure of the Roman elegy book is a problem still in urgent need of further research, despite an already bulky bibliography (Ites' dissertation is still fundamental; see also below pp. 133ff.). In particular, more stress should be placed upon Greek Hellenistic models. The dramatic arrangement of parts of the Roman elegy book shows distinct resemblances to the arrangement of Hellenistic collections of epigrams (a few remarks are found in Davis 13ff.; the view that collections like Meleager's *Garland* were arranged alphabetically was already refuted sufficiently by A. Wifstrand, *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie* [Lunds Univ. Arsskr. xxiii. 3, 1926], 5ff., who conveniently reassumes the previous research; Wifstrand's arguments have recently been taken up and strengthened by Cameron 19ff., 32ff., who also shows that even in the alphabetical order of Philip's garland epigrams were arranged on thematic principles inside every letter). For patriotic poetry as an antidote to erotic disappointment cf. also Hor. *C.* II. ix. 17ff. where the poet presumably refers to elegies of Valgius. The motif may be regarded as the reversion of the sentiment expressed in Hor. *Iamb.* xi and xvi, a concept which may well go back to Archilochos; see M. L. West on Arch. fr. 196 and 'Two Notes on the Cologne Epode of Archilochus', *ZPE* 26 (1977), 44ff. (on Horace and the Cologne epode of Archilochos see also A. Henrichs, 'Riper than a Pear: Parian Invective in Theokritos', *ZPE* 39 (1980), 16f.); the connection had already been noted by Kiessling-Heinze, who do however reject a direct Archilochean model; the thought that love causes *inertia* is, of course, quite common; cf. e.g. Prop. I. xii, where Enk's commentary cites further parallels).

[40] The loss of the book division can be explained even more convincingly if we accept Heyworth's view that II. xi - xii are dislocated (see above p. 11). However, it suffices to assume that the text losses between II. iii and iv (and perhaps elsewhere) caused I. i. - xii to be too short to be considered sufficient to form a complete book. For attested examples of the loss of book division one need only think of N's failure to divide books I and II (see Butrica 25, 27), cf. also book V of Corippus' *bellum Libycum*, transmitted without separation from book IV (see Diggle-Goodyear in their edition (Cambridge 1970), p. 92), and the divergence in mss. concerning the beginning of book VI of the *Aeneid* which is reflected in Servius' remarks on VI. 1f. (this and other biographical interpretations of ms. variants are without foundation and may be compared to similar fictions in the scholia of Greek authors; see Günther 2, 27 n. 41 with bibliography; on Vergil cf. also G. P. Goold, 'Servius and the Helen Episode', *HSCP* 74 [1970], 124ff., 161-2; J. E. G. Zetzel, '*Emendavi ad Tironem*: Some Notes on Scholarship in the Second Century A. D.', *HSCP* 77 [1973], 227-45) and the aberrations of some mss. for the beginning of books II and VI of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (MW begin book II with I. 748; U begins book VI with V. 662); cf. also Alton/Wormell/Courtney in the preface of their edition of the *Fasti* p. IX on the false book division between books ii and iii in some mss. A particularly close parallel to Propertius may be seen in the book of Catullus, if it is indeed a conflation of three separate books as has recently been suggested again by G. Lee (*The poems of Catullus* [Oxford 1990], xiiff.; for a useful review of earlier discussions cf. B. Coppel, *Das Alliusgedicht. Zur Redaktion des Catullcorpus* [Heidelberg 1973], 141ff. and more recently R. J. Tarrant in *TT*; see also the following note). On the failure in Greek papyri to divide books by *spatium* or at all see S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer, Papyrologica Coloniensia* III (Opladen 1967), 18ff. For an interesting example of intentional interference with book division cf. the divergences of mss. of Statius' *Achilleid* (see Dilke 23).

pened, and we can now go on to look around for further major lacunae in the text of both books united in our book II. We shall soon discover that the fragmentary state of the text in several places has not only caused the book division to disappear but is also responsible to a considerable degree for the failure to divide poems, so frequently observed in book II.[41]

---

[41] The following failures to divide poems in book II are due to the fragmentary state of at least one of the two poems: ix. 1-40, 41-52 (see below p. 15f.), x (not separated from the fragment ix. 41-52 in Π), xviii A/B/C (see below p. 32f.), xxii A/B (p. 19f.); even the running together of xxiv A and B and LPKWJ's failure to separate xxiv from xxiii may not be wholly independent of the lacunae after xxiv 10 (see below p. 17f.) as the combination of xxvi A and B may be connected with the lacuna after 28. As we shall see below (p. 31f.) the same is true for xxx A and B and the failure of several mss. to divide xxix, xxx, xxxi at all (see above p. 4 n. 8), and there are two further cases in II. vi (p. 24ff.) and xvi (p. 26). Even the missing separation of xxviii. 47-62 from the preceding as well as NMURC's faulty division after 34 is connected with an omission (p. 21ff.). FLKWJ's failure to separate III. viii from vii may be due to the desperate state of the text of the latter (see below p. 38ff.). The situation appears to be quite similar to that in Catullus, where all cases of complete absence of any division between separate pieces are due to a fragmentary text (xiv B, lviii B, lxxviii B and ?xcv B). NMURC's faulty division before II. xxvi. 29 is equally due to a lacuna before the verse. NΠ's division before III. xv. 11 also goes back to textual corruption (see below p. 128f.). In these cases and perhaps in II. vii. 12, where a lacuna has been assumed by many, we deal with an intentional editorial choice to divide off a seemingly disconnected passage. III. xxv too may have been divided from xxiv intentionally; in fact, this choice convinced most modern scholars until Fedeli and Goold restored the unity of xxiv and xxv (before them accepted by Scaliger, Carutti, Baehrens, Rothstein and Richmond).
Many of the other missing divisions affect poems that go together as dramatic pairs (see most recently Davis with bibliography p. 118). It is a verbal quibble whether we wish to describe these pairs as two separate poems referring to each other or as one poem in two separate parts. The remarks above on poem division and especially on the failure to distinguish clearly in language between poem and part of a major poetic work would indicate that for the ancients such a distinction was rather irrelevant. It seems quite likely that indeed the failure to separate some of these pairs in Propertius as well as in Ovid (see G. Luck, rev. Jäger, *Zweigliedrige Gedichte und Gedichtpaare bei Properz und in Ovids Amores*, *Gnomon* 43 (1971), 514ff. and above p. 4 n. 7) is due to a less strong indication of division in the archetype (perhaps there were no separate titles *in linea* for the second poem; cf. Mynors' reconstruction of the archetype of Catullus in his *OCT* p. xivf.; cf. also Lindsay 35, 53, Keller 187 on Porphyrio's interpretation of *carm.* III. i-vi as one continuous poem). The loss of titles *in linea* would also account well for the failure to divide off fragments. We might perhaps ask if some ancient editions as well could have employed different ways of dividing more closely connected poems, like I. viii A and B, xi and xii (not separated in N), xxviii 1-46 and 47-62 (see below p. 21ff.), xxix A and B or xxxiii A and B, and other wholly independent pieces, say, the former by paragraphos the latter by coronis. This must however remain purely speculative, and one should note that the symmetrical arrangement of book I, demonstrated in an admirably succinct paper by O. Skutsch (= Skutsch 1; cf. also Courtney 1 and below p. 131 and p. 140), suggests that I. viii A and B counted as two single poems, and Ovid's pairs are normally separated in the transmission.

So let us stay for a moment with the first part of our book II. There is at least one other place where we possess only the fragment of a poem:

ix. 41-52:
sidera sunt testes et matutina pruina
  et furtim misero ianua aperta mihi,
te nihil in uita nobis acceptius umquam:
  nunc quoque erit, quamuis sis inimica, nihil.
nec domina ulla meo ponet uestigia lecto:
  solus ero, quoniam non licet esse tuum.
atque utinam, si forte pios eduximus annos,
  ille uir in medio fiat amore lapis!
non ob regna magis diris cecidere sub armis
  Thebani media non sine matre duces,
quam, mihi si media liceat pugnare puella,
  mortem ego non fugiam morte subire tua.

Without much doubt a lacuna has to be assumed between 48 and 49, and this not only because of the sudden address with the bare possessive pronoun in 52.[42] Lines 49-52 introduce a new twist of thought which cannot follow immediately upon 47-48 and some have even proposed to cut off 49-52 from what precedes altogether.[43] As 47-8 and 49-52 are connected by a common theme—they both refer to the rival who conquered the poet's *domina* —, this is wholly unwanted. Nevertheless in all probability more than one couplet has been lost after 48. It seems quite likely that the mutual killing of the sons of Oedipus, not particularly appropriate to the rivalry between the poet and his mistress's lover, was not directly linked to an outburst of

---

Incorrect poem divisions like that after II. vii. 12, xxviii 34 can perhaps be explained by running initials misinterpreted as poem divisions (see Lowe I, 196ff., 266ff.). Others like that after II. i. 78 or between III. i and ii may be due to misinterpretation of marginal signs. That between III. xxiv/ xxv may have been introduced intentionally.

[42] All passages which have been adduced to justify this are extremely dubious; II. xxvii. 10 can be excluded right away since Housman's *fles tu* in 7 is patently correct (rightly accepted by Goold). III. iv. 4 *tua* is impossible after *uiri* (3) and perhaps Richardson's lacuna after l. 4 is the best solution (Wistrand's *Quiris* for *uiri*, accepted by Goold, is too clever. *uiri* is well established in similar contexts [cf. Verg. *Ae.* ii. 373, iv. 573, ix. 158, 376, x. 280, 737, xi. 14] and *Quiris* is—unintenionally—humorous in a military context; an intentional joke seems highly inappropriate to me). In III. xiii. 42 Barber's *uestri* ... *foci* has rightly been accepted by Hanslik, Fedeli and Goold. In IV. xi. 42 we should accept the easy conjecture *nostros* for *uestros* (thus rightly Goold). For III. vii. 11 see below p. 39f.

[43] See Camps *ad loc.* (followed by Goold); cf. also below p. 16 n. 47. Already Scaliger divided off ix. 49-52 as a new poem, which he however united with the following elegy.

hatred from the poet like e.g. II. viii. 3-4[44] which Housman transposed to this place.[45] I rather think that another mythical example preceded 49-52, a duel fought for a woman presumably in the woman's presence, like e.g. Hercules' fight with Achelous in the presence of Deianeira.[46] The train of thought after 48 might have been something like: <Oh, how disastrous are rivalries for the sake of a woman! Therefore, you who have intruded into my love be cautious towards a desperate man's actions. Think of the awful things such rivalries have brought to men; think of the terrible fight of Hercules and Achelous and how the sight alone frightened the poor girl for whom it was fought.> Indeed, not even the mutual killing of the two brothers Eteocles and Polyneices, while their mother was striving to part them, was more dreadful; were Cynthia the prize I would not shrink even from such a death if only I could kill you too.

Having recognised that the end of the passage is affected by a major loss of text, we should not hesitate to take the next liberating step and cut off II. ix. 41-52 as a whole from the preceding poem.[47] The two couplets 37-40 make an excellent end of a poem; indeed one may regard them as a typical Propertian conclusion.[48] After this 41ff. could only be a lame afterthought, and if we compare 40 as the end of a poem with 52 there can hardly be any doubt which is the better. ix. 41-52 appear to be a case almost exactly parallel with II. iii. 45-54. Again our passage cannot stand by itself, quite apart from the lacuna between 48 and 49, and neither is 41 a suitable beginning of a poem nor 52 a likely conclusion. 41-8 and 49-52 are two scattered fragments of the poem following upon II. ix; fittingly it too featured the rival who had been appearing in viii and ix. II. viii, ix A and B form a cycle of three poems about the rival and the poet's resignation and farewell to Cynthia, analogous to the cycle of three related poems at the end of book I (xvii-xix).

A further lacuna of similar length in the first half of book II will be

---

[44] *nullae sunt inimicitiae nisi amoris acerbae:/ ipsum me iugula, lenior hostis ero.*

[45] *magis* (49) must refer to a preceding clause; it cannot be answered by *quam* (51), which would be extremely harsh. *quam* (*mortem*) is plainly relative (thus rightly Butler-Barber). *media* may well be used in a different sense in 50 and 52 (cf. Hor. *C.* II. xix. 27 with Nisbet-Hubbard's (Oxford 1978) note *ad loc.*); I think Paley was right to translate *media* ... *puella* with "were Cynthia placed between us as a prize". *medio* in 48 is used in another sense anyway. See also Shackleton Bailey 2, 82.

[46] Cf. S. *Tr.* 21-5, 507ff., for Achelous in elegy cf. Prop. II. xxxiv. 33, Ov. *Am.* III. vi. 35, 103.

[47] That 41ff. do not belong together with the preceding poem was stated already by Wakker, who was also the first to separate 41-48 and 49-52.

[48] Cf. Abel, 84, 92.

discussed below[49] because it is connected with a major dislocation. Before proceeding to the original book III I must mention briefly two places of minor importance. A loss of text has long been suspected after lines 37-8 of the opening poem of book II (II. i),[50] and a further lacuna of more than one distich I suspect in the remarkably short poem II. ii. The corrupt beginning of line 11[51] is a notorious *crux* which hardly admits a certain solution. It is, however, strange that few critics appear to have realised that the problems of the text go beyond the obviously nonsensical *satis* of the transmitted text. 11f. as a whole do not fit *incedit* (6) and *spatiatur* (7), and I suspect a major lacuna between 10 and 11.[52]

Looking for major omissions in the second half of book II (i.e. the original book III) we may consider first five places where a convincing case has been made for a lacuna of considerable length: between xviii. 4 and 5, at the beginning and the end of xxii B (= xxii. 43-50), between xxiv. 10 and 11, before and possibly at the end of xxx A (= xxx. 1-12) and recently also at the end of xxxiii.[53] Let us first consider xviii. 4/5 and xxiv 10/11 as the least complicated cases. As to xxiv there can be no doubt about the necessity of a lacuna after line 10;[54] it is however less clear whether 11-16 are a fragment of a new

---

49 See p. 24f.

50 *Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles,/ hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden.* It seems quite clear that Housman's translation of *testatur* (accepted by Butler-Barber, Camps and Richardson) must be correct; other interpretations have rightly been rejected by Butler-Barber ("The sense 'call to witness' is impossible; for it would imply that 'Caesar cites Maecenas to testify that he, Caesar, has been a true friend', see Housman l.c. The only alternative is yet more absurd, for it makes Theseus and Achilles summon their friends to prove the possibility of a friend such as Maecenas!"). Yet it is true that the thought needs further help from the context and a lacuna can be regarded as certain; see also below p. ooo. For Housman's transposition of III. ix. 33-34 after II. i. 38, accepted recently by Goold (ed.) see below p. 47.

51 *+Mercurio satis+ fertur Boebeidos undis/ uirgineum Brimo composuisse latus* (11f.)

52 The first scholar who attempted to deal with the problems of the text appears to have been Carutti (for his and other solutions see Smyth *ad loc.*). Among recent editors and commentators only Richardson and Goold seem to be conscious of the problem. For their transposition of 9-12 after II. xxix. 28 see below.

53 For a further lacuna see below p. 18f.

54 1-10 have been connected with the preceding poem by Tremenheere, Richardson and Goold (Rothstein connects 11-6 as well; Scaliger already made xxii-xxiv one poem). Yet nothing suggests xxiii is incomplete (xxiii. 23-4 are presumably an example of 'Schlußinterpolation'; see below p. 155), and the address by the *interlocutor* in xxiv. 1-2 is typical of the beginning of a poem (cf. II. ii. 1-4). For an excellent interpretation of II. xxiv cf. Jacoby 427f., who implicitly refutes the objections brought against the current interpretation of xxiv by Shackleton Bailey (2, 110ff.). Jacoby is also right in his endorsement of Baehrens' *retinendus* for *reticendus* in the difficult line 4 (recommended also by Shackleton Bailey 2, 112).

poem or still part of the same elegy as 1-10.[55] The matter cannot be settled in a definitive way, but on balance much more speaks in favour of the second alternative. Still the lacuna is likely to be longer than one distich. It may further be considered whether the poem really ends with line 16, which appears to me to be a rather abrupt close whatever the content of the missing lines before 11. I think there is some reason to believe that the end of the poem is lost. If this was the case, it would explain the loss of poem division before line 17 (= xxiv B).[56]

We come closer to cases like II. iii. 45-54/ iv. 1ff. or ix. 41-52 with the lacuna between xviii. 4 and 5. Again the need for a major lacuna has been universally recognised and need hardly be argued against recent defenders of the transmission.[57] Nor is it necessary to refute those who try to connect xviii. 1-4 with the preceding poem.[58] xviii. 5 certainly cannot start a poem, and it is extremely implausible that xviii. 1-4 can stand for themselves as a lonely little epigram in the middle of an elegy book.[59] The only serious alternatives are whether xviii. 1-4 and 5-22 are fragments of one and the same or rather of two poems. I do not see how we could exclude the first alternative with absolute certainty, if we assume a major lacuna; but as there is no obvious connection between the topic of xviii. 1-4 and 5ff., the balance is clearly tipped in favour of separation.

Goold's Loeb edition reports Heyworth's separation of xxxiii. 41-44 as a fragment (xxxiii C). The two couplets show no thematic connection with the preceding elegy and 35-40 fit well as the conclu-

---

55 Separation is advocated by Camps, followed by Hanslik and Fedeli (see the preceding note).

56 See above p. 14 n. 41. There is no reason to believe that more has been lost than the end of xxiv A. xxiv B looks very much like the beginning of a poem. One should however note that xxiv B is defective as well, though the lacuna between 22 and 23 (first suggested by L. Mueller) need not be longer than one distich.

57 Enk and Fedeli print 1-22 as one poem without lacuna; 1-22 were connected with xvii by Rothstein; for a more recent discussion see W. R. Nethercut, 'Propertius 2. 18: "Kein einheitliches Gedicht..."', *ICS* 5 (1980), 94-109.

58 The connection of xviii. 1-4 with xvii (already suggested by Scaliger and approved recently by Enk, Hanslik and Richardson) was sufficiently refuted by Ites 34. See also below p. 122.

59 An epigram of only two couplets would be unique in the Propertian corpus and is plainly impossible in the middle of a book. Epigrams do occur at the end of book I and, possibly, of the original book II. Except for I. xxi, xxii and II. xi no epigrams proper can be found in Propertius; for II. xii, xviii C, xxii B and xxx A see p. 11, 18ff., 31 f.

sion of xxxiii B. Goold rightly accepts Heyworth's suggestion; and also Barber's reordering (43-4, 41-2).

If we now have a look at the first of the remaining two cases this will carry us right into the middle of our problem. II. xxii B (= 43-50)[60] can be regarded as the most obvious case for a dislocated fragment in the Propertian corpus. Its separation from the preceding poem goes back at least to Giovanni Pontano.[61] Not only would xxii B appear rather awkward as a complete poem[62]; the suspicion that it is indeed a fragment is also supported by the fact that the last line (50) is missing in N and should in all probability be regarded as an interpolation to fill a lacuna.[63] But xxii B has not only no connection to xxii A, it seems to be quite out of place in the position where we now find it.

xxii A, xxiii and xxiv A form a cycle of three poems connected by a common theme and addressee.[64] The topic and sentiment of xxii B are as inappropriate between these poems as is the address to the *domina*. xxii A and xxiii both convey the light, frivolous tone of the defence of venal love without any suggestion that the reason for the poet's conversion to the charms of easy women might lie in the harsh treatment he experiences at the hands of his *domina*. That this is indeed the case is revealed only in the last poem of the cycle, xxiv A, which thus leads to a new series of Cynthia poems, xxiv B-xxvi. A poem about the cruelty and the *nequitia* of the *domina*, like the one of which xxii B appears to be a fragment, spoils completely the dramatic development of the closely knit cycle, xxii A, xxiii and xxiv A. xxii B

---

60 For the text of this and the following examples of dislocation see the appendix below p. 53ff. I give my own text, which does not correspond fully with any printed edition, but I refrain from discussing every textual decision.

61 In the mss. Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 500 (Hanslik's q; see Butrica 209f.) and its transcript Valencia, Biblioteca Universitaria 725 (Hanslik's 107; see Butrica 298). The division is also found in three other closely related mss. (Pesaro, Bibl. Oliveriana 1167; Parma, Bibl. Palatina, Fondo Parm. 716 and Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek 3153). It is not, however, in Butrica's *Tomacellianus* (cf. Butrica 106ff., 332) as Butrica tells me *per litteras*.

62 Moreover, *aut si* ... *sin* in 43 is more difficult than seems to be appreciated (the majority of commentators skip over the problem); there appears to be no precise parallel (for the nearest examples see *ThlL* s.v. II [col. 1572]). One could therefore consider the possibility that *aut* points back to a lost passage and not forward to *sin*. Yet it would be most awkward if the alternative *sin es non dura* had been alluded to already in the preceding, as we must assume in this case, and I am therefore inclined to accept the abnormality with *aut si* ... *sin*.

63 See below. p. 80f.

64 For xxiv A and its coherence with the cycle see above n. 54.

is not only an obvious case of a severely fragmented poem; it is also a *prima facie* case for wholesale transposition.

Indeed, transposition of xxii B after xvii. 4 was suggested by Housman;[65] his proposal was modified by Tremenheere,[66] who places the piece after xvii. 2, and this transposition once met with the approval of P. J. Enk.[67] There is no question that xxii B fits nicely into the situation of xvii, but it has been objected that xvii seems to be complete as it stands and does not require a supplement. That is true; nevertheless one might perhaps expect the poet to elaborate a bit further on the situation announced so abruptly in xvii. 1-2 before turning to a series of mythical examples illustrating the tough life of a lover. xxii B does just that and the fragment seems to me to fit particularly well after xvii. 4 where Housman put it, right before the two *exempla* Tantalus and Sisyphus. xvii. 1-2 expound the poem's theme in general terms and it is just to such an exposition that xvii. 3-4 refer.[68] This couplet then leads to a personal statement fittingly extended by xxii B.

Of course, Housman could not put xxii B after xvii. 2, because he wanted to transpose xvii. 13-14 to this place. The distich is certainly awkward where it stands, because it interrupts the cohesion between xvii. 11-12 and 15-16. Many have accepted Lachmann's transposition of 13-14 after 16,[69] but this is unattractive because 17-8 fit ill after 13-14.[70] Housman's transposition, which has been accepted recently by Goold, is far better than Lachmann's but still fails to carry conviction. As has been pointed out above, xvii. 3-4 cohere closely with 1-2, and lines 13-14 before 3-4 would spoil the whole thing.

Possibly there is another solution for these lines, which will be discussed below in its proper context,[71] but whatever one may think about lines 13-14 a compelling case can be made for xxii B belonging between xvii. 4 and 5. If it seems difficult to fulfil Butler-Barber's demand for a rational explanation of this dislocation, Housman's transposition of xxii B comes, to my mind, as close as possible to their demand for absolute conviction. Trying to find an explanation for the displacement of a longer passage like xxii B, one will suspect that it

---

65 See Housman 33.

66 In his edition of 1931.

67 See 'Lucubrationes Propertianae', *Mnemosyne* III 3 (1936), 160; in his commentary however he takes back this view.

68 For *hoc* (2)—*horum* (3) cf. II. v. 1 - 3.

69 Approved by Butler-Barber, Barber, Enk and Hanslik.

70 Cf. R. Helm, rev. Butler-Barber, *Propertius*, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 54. Jahrgang, no. 28/29 (1934), 787f.

71 See p. 127.

might have been caused by a major omission[72] which later led to the incorrect insertion of the omitted text; of course, this appears particularly plausible in view of the fragmentary condition of the text of book II illustrated above. But if we assume xxii B to have been lost in its original place this still leaves the question why it should have strayed so far. If it was omitted and wrongly inserted at a later stage, we would rather expect it to migrate to another position in the same poem, perhaps to the end of it. At best it might be attached to one of the two surrounding poems; but how could a fragment travel four or five poems up or down the road?

So let us make another try: if xxii B cannot stand where it does, is it possible to contemplate its displacement over a shorter space? If we are agreed that it cannot belong in the cycle xxii A, xxiii, xxiv A, could it be a fragment of a poem preceding xxii A? This would still be rather odd, because xx-xxi are themselves connected with the following cycle.[73] Looking for the shortest possible distance we might transpose xxii B after xxiv A. This is still some way off and one wonders if the space that can be saved outweighs the advantage of having xxii B after xvii. 4 where it sits so perfectly. Even this little experiment only seems to vindicate Housman's transposition.

Before we try to find a better explanation for what might have happened to xxii B it will be useful to assemble a few other cases of dislocations of longer passages where an easy explanation is possible. To this end we can turn first to a transposition which again was suggested long ago.

II. xxviii[74] has almost universally been recognised to consist of more than one poem; at least the division before line 47, introduced by Lachmann, seems to be certain.[75] Many scholars have opted for a

---

72 For a brilliant review of such dislocations in the text of Greek drama see J. Jackson, *Marginalia scaenica* (Oxford 1955), 1ff. At least for the first case he adduces (E. *IA* 653-664) Jackson's ingenious solution is in my opinion beyond doubt. It has not only been accepted in my Teubner edition of the play (Leipzig 1988) but also in the excellent new edition with commentary by W. Stockert (Wien 1992).

73 For the cohesion between xx/xxi and xxii-xxiv cf. Ites, 36ff.

74 See below p. 57f.

75 For attempts to defend the unity see below. That it is wrong to describe poems like this as a dramatic monologue—a view already foreshadowed by Wilamowitz (*Hellenistische Dichtung* [Berlin 1924] I, 235 n.)—has duly been pointed out by K. Barwick, 'Catulls c. 68 und eine Kompositionsform der römischen Elegie und Epigrammatik', *WJbb* 2 (1947), 14 f. Yet confusion about such terms as 'dramatic unity' or 'dramatic monologue' is still widespread in modern discussions of related problems and can induce the same editor to print I. viii as one but II. xxviii as two poems (thus e.g. Hanslik). A correct understanding of the phenomenon of dramatic poem structure such as we find in the 'running commentaries' on sacral scenes familiar in Hellenistic poetry should start from mimetic poems as Theocritus'

second division of the remaining first part; thus Knoche in his important treatment of the various problems of the piece[76] argued for a further division before line 33. According to him 33-46 form a separate poem defective at the beginning where the invocation of Jupiter, necessary before line 33, has been lost.[77] Most editors have preferred to deal with the problem of 33 by accepting Passerat's transposition of the couplet 33-34 after the invocation of Jupiter in 1-2.[78] This renders Knoche's lacuna unnecessary, but it still requires us to divide off 35ff. as a separate poem, because 35 does not fit directly after 32. Line 33 certainly stands well after 1-2, yet Passerat's transposition destroys the cohesion between 1-2 and 3ff.[79] and between 33-34 and 35ff.[80] To have to divide 1-46 is another serious drawback of both this and Knoche's solution. 1-46 and 47-62 apparently form one of the commonly found dramatic pairs,[81] whereas the threefold division accepted by many editors would be remarkable.[82]

If Passerat's transposition does not produce a satisfactory result, we could still consider Knoche's lacuna between 32 and 33; perhaps a lacuna of more than one couplet would even dispense us from

---

Pharmakeutriae or 15th Idyll or its Roman counterpart Hor. *C.* I. xxvii. The best description of this mimetic technique of composition is given by Nisbet-Hubbard in their commentary on the latter poem: "we seem to be looking at a one-man act or overhearing a telephone conversation". In all these cases the development in time can be regarded as real. Only Vergil *ecl.* ii goes one step further; there time passes from morning at the beginning of the poem (8ff.) to evening at the end (66ff.). Whether there are Hellenistic precedents for this we cannot know and is of minor importance. It is however important to note the fundamental difference to dramatic pairs of two poems such as Propertius I. viii A/B, xi/ xii etc. In the former examples the poem comments on a continuous development in time or, in Vergil's case, refers to a developing background. In this case we may observe a contraction of the dramatic time but not a time break between two sharply contrasting situations. In dramatic pairs like Prop. I. viii A/B we are confronted with two clearly divided blocks referring to the same event from two neatly divided points in time without any indication of a transition. This phenomenon is not only different as such from pseudo-dramatic poem structure, the two phenomena should not even be regarded as genetically linked to each other. Of course, the dramatic pairs constitute a higher unity, yet a unity to be considered in the context of the pseudo-dramatic book structure, and it may be useful to remind ourselves that pseudo-dramatic pairs may not only occur directly beside each other but also on longer distances as is shown by I. vii - ix and I. x - xiii, both framing a dramatic pair.

[76] See Knoche 3.

[77] Lachmann's proposal to take *coniunx* in 33 as a vocative was rightly rejected by Butler-Barber and Enk.

[78] Accepted by Butler-Barber, Barber, Enk, Camps, Hanslik, Fedeli.

[79] See Hubbard 53.

[80] Already pointed out by Lachmann.

[81] Cf. p. 14 n. 41.

[82] The division before 35 in N cannot be claimed to support this.

introducing poem division after line 32. This could, at first sight, seem to be a rather economical and sensible solution; against it must be held that the couplet 31-32 looks very much like the conclusion of a poem,[83] after which the repeated prayer to Jupiter could only make an awkward appendix. But if 32 appears to be the end of a poem, is there then something to be said for dividing 1-46 after all?

But let us first consider yet another recent proposal. Heyworth[84] suggested transposing 33-34 after 46. This ingenious transposition has been greeted with much enthusiasm by Goold, who prints Heyworth's text, including his conjecture *et* for *haec* in 47.[85] Thus he thinks the unity of xxviii as a whole can be preserved. The forward merit of Heyworth's arrangement is obviously that it preserves, like Knoche's text, the neat connection between 1-2 and 3-4. However, his proposal has other drawbacks. Even with the change of *haec* to *et*, which seems to me indispensable for Heyworth's solution, I do not think that 47ff. can form a unity with the preceding elegy. To my mind it is most awkward to assume that Persephone's *clementia* should refer not to Cynthia's reconvalescence but rather to the fact that Cynthia is still alive despite her currant illness (as Heyworth has to assume) when in v. 59 (*tu quoniam es, mea lux, magno dimissa periclo* ...) she suddenly appears to have recovered completely. As I have said above[86] I do not contest at all that a poem may refer to a development in time, even to an unrealistic time lapse, but in this particular case I find it most unnatural that the poet should first make a lot of fuss about thanking the gods that his ill mistress has not yet died, only in order to drop a remark a few lines later that she has now recovered completely. I simply cannot bring myself to believe that we should adopt such an awkward interpretation here when a much more natural one suggests itself. Moreover, with the transmitted *haec* v. 47 is very apt for opening a poem[87], and I cannot see how 35 can follow directly on 32, and above all 31-32 appear to be the end of a poem, as I have said above. the result achieved by Heyworth's transposition is not, in my opinion, satisfactory enough to justify a double interference with the text. There must be a better solution.

We must start, I think, from two propositions: 1) that 47ff. is not part of the same poem as the preceding but probably forms the sec-

---

83 See above p. 22 n. 76.

84 Heyworth 1, 403f.

85 *haec tua, Persephone, maneat clementia, nec tu,/ Persephonae coniunx, saevior esse uelis* (47/8).

86 Cf. p. 21 n. 75.

87 Cf. II. v, xxivB.

ond piece of a dramatic pair, and 2) that 32 is presumably the end of a poem. Indeed, a solution has been proposed long ago which takes account of these considerations and cuts the knot at one stroke. Baehrens transposed not only 33-34 but 33-46 as a whole after line 2. This solution preserves the unity of 33-46 and at the same time transforms the whole block 1-46 into a well structured poem proceeding nicely from the despair of 1-2, 33-46 to the ever more light and playful tone of 13ff.[88]

One could object that Baehrens's transposition again destroys the coherence between vv. 1-2 and 3. This is true but paradoxically the damage done is less great than with Passerat's minor transposition. With Baehrens's reordering 1-2, 33-46 form a ring composition in which 43-46 refer back to the prayer in 1-2. Thus *pericla* in 46 provides the antecedent for *enim* in 3, and *Iouem* in v. 44 is close enough to suggest a connection with *tempus* etc. in 3f. and the powers of the weather god pointed out by Hubbard.[89] Richardson has rightly accepted Baehrens's transposition;[90]

In this case it is certainly much easier to accept a major dislocation than in the case of xxii B. We need only assume that 33-46 dropped out at their original place and were later added in the margin. When the reference to their original place in the poem was lost or misunderstood, they were added at the end of xxviii A, i.e. after line 32. Exactly the same process can be paralleled from two further poems of Propertius. There however we have to leave the trodden path and break some new ground.

Let us turn first to II. vi.[91] Despite some misgivings about the train of thought in the second half of the poem,[92] modern editors have generally resigned themselves to accepting the transmitted sequence

---

88 Cf. Knoche 3, 67-69 (= 332-4); for the structure of the poem see also below p. 143.

89 See above p. 22 n. 79.

90 If one objects that the two poems of the pair (1-2, 33-46, 3-32 and 47-62) are extremely unequal in length in contrast to other such pairs in Propertius (e.g. I. viiiA and B) one may at least point to Ov. *Am.* II. ii and iii. Moreover it may be observed that II. xxvii, thematically preluding the theme of xxviiiA/B, is of exactly the same length as xxviiiB (16 lines); see below p. 145.

91 See below p. 53f.

92 "While the whole of this elegy deals with the same theme, sc. the faithlessness of women, the sequence of thought is so far from clear that it is hard to resist the conviction that the text has been mutilated. 1-22 present no serious difficulty ... But from that point (i.e. 23) onwards lacunae have, not without reason, been suspected, and the cumulative effect of a series of abrupt transitions is almost overwhelming", Butler-Barber p. 200.

as it stands.[93] We have to go back to Lachmann and Baehrens to find scholars worried enough to interfere with the text. 25-36 as a whole may seem a rather curious excursus between the apparently connected couplets 23-24 and 37-38. After only one couplet, featuring *templa pudicitiae* (25f.), the text jumps to a curse on obscene painting in 27-34, only to come back to the neglect of an ominous temple in 35f. Lachmann saw no other remedy but to divide off as separate bits 25-26, 27-34 and 35-36 by four lacunae. Indeed, even if one were prepared to accept a certain inconsistency, at least *sed non immerito!* in 35 is extremely harsh after 34 and calls for emendation.[94] 35-36 clearly belong directly after 25-26.[95] Attempts to remove the couplet 35-36 alone[96] are futile, because 37 does not cohere well with 34 either. I therefore propose to remove 27-34 from their present position and regard them as a fragment of a poem following after II. vi. One may further consider placing 23-24 after 38. This would certainly be an advantage but cannot be proved necessary. After the removal of 27-34 the poem proceeds fairly well.

The displacement can be accounted for if we assume the same process as in xxviii. Of two adjacent poems we now possess the first, vi. 1-26, 35-42, completely, the second only in the fragment vi. 27-34. At some time the second half of the first poem (i.e. 35-42) as well as the largest part of the second (i.e. everything except 27-34) was omitted, leading to the juxtaposition of 1-26 and 27-34 without poem division. Later the second half of 1-26 (i.e. 35-42) was added in the margin and later still migrated to the end of what appeared to be one poem (i.e. 1-34) in exactly the same way as we could observe in II. xxviii above.

Perhaps we can even detect a further indication that the text of II.vi is defective. I think there is every reason to suspect a lacuna after v. 6 with Burman. The text is not utterly impossible as it stands, but

---

[93] It has been accepted even in the new Loeb edition of Goold (for his text in vi. 35 see below n. 94; for the transposition of III. xviii. 29-30 in this poem see p. 48). For the best defence that can be made of the transmitted text as it stands see Shackleton Bailey 2, 72.

[94] L. Brandt (*Quaestiones Propertianae* [Diss. Berlin 1880], 22) is surely right to punctuate after *immerito* (cf. II. xxx. 19; see below p. 87f, and I. xvii. 1). To take it with the following phrase is plainly absurd and has been rightly rejected by Enk, who paraphrases: "sed non sine causa i.e. non sine nostra culpa haec fiunt." But 33-34 do not speak of the bad things that happen now but of how good the old times were. Recently Goold (ed.) reads *sed nunc immeritum* with Luck and Heinsius, but *immeritum* is odd as an epithet of *fanum* ; it gives a wrong emphasis. Surely, temples do not deserve to be neglected; there is no need to point this out.

[95] *sed non immerito* refers to 26 (*si cuiuis nuptae quidlibet esse licet?*).

[96] Already Kuinoel placed it after 26.

7ff. follow very abruptly upon the series of comparisons in 1-6, and in view of the fragmentary state of the book a lacuna seems quite likely.[97]

Our third example is II. xvi.[98] As in II. vi, we are confronted with a strange excursus (31-42) between two surrounding parts which seem to be closely connected (29-30 and 43ff.). Several transpositions of single couplets have been proposed, but the only attempts so far to address the foremost problem, the complete lack of any connection between 41-42 and 43ff., have been Housman's and Butler's removal of 41-42 either by inserting the couplet somewhere in the third book[99] or by deleting it.[100] But even so, 43ff. do not fit much better after 39. Again the problem can be solved satisfactorily only by a complete removal of an entire passage, 31-42. To transpose, in addition, 29-30 after 46, as has been suggested by Carutti[101], would be a further improvement, but without 31-42 the transmitted order (i.e. 27-30, 43-56) is acceptable, at least from line 19 onwards. In the first part of the poem few problems remain, but these can be dealt with by minor transpositions of single couplets and will be discussed below.[102] For the assumption that 31-42 are indeed a fragment of another poem following upon II. xvi in its reduced form we can detect a further indication, not noticed so far by commentators: xvi. 33f.[103] speak of a long period of troubles the poet has experienced with his mistress, but *modo* in line 1 implies that the rival who destroyed the happiness of II. xiv and xv has only just arrived. It appears very likely that xvi. 31-42 are a fragment of a poem standing in the same relation to xvi. 1-30, 43-56 as I. xii to xi or II. xxxiii B to xxiii A.

These three strictly parallel cases, II. vi, xvi and xxviii, admit a simple explanation of the process of dislocation. The omitted block of text which was recovered later and added in the margin was in a subsequent copy added at the end of the poem, or more precisely at the end of what was conceived as a single poem. That a portion of text whose location seemed to be uncertain should be relegated to the end of a larger unit is not only a reasonable assumption, the process

---

97 Cf. Giardina *ad loc.*

98 See below p. 54ff.

99 Housman suggested transposition after III. xi. 38, Butler and Tremenheere after III. xxii. 22.

100 Deletion had already been suggested by Carutti, approved by Vivona and considered also by Butler-Barber.

101 Accepted in Goold's Loeb edition.

102 See p. 35ff.

103 *Tot iam abiere dies, cum me nec cura theatri/ nec tetigit Campi, nec mea mensa iuvat*; for the transmitted *mensa* see Shackleton Bailey 2, 96.

is by no means unheard of and there is ample evidence for it in the ms. tradition of other authors.

In particular, the tradition of Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae* is characterised by a large number of mss. which omit all or part of three longer passages.[104] There is a fair number of mss. in which omitted portions are added in the margin or at the end of the respective book.[105] Further examples for the same process can be seen e.g. in mss. of Lucretius, Catullus, Horace and Statius.[106] I cannot cite documented examples for the relegation of omitted passages to the end of a poem[107] but a case quite close to my assumption is offered by the tradition of the major declamations of Quintilian. There a

---

[104] See Hall, *DRP* 55ff.

[105] See Hall, *DRP* 57 n. 2 and 58 n. 2. There are also examples for the insertion of a passage at the beginning, cf. Hall's G1 (see p. 11). For a further example from Seneca see below p. 35 n. 145.

[106] ii. 757-806, v. 928-979, i. 734-785, ii. 253-304 are added at the end of the famous codex Q(uadratus) in Lucretius (see Bailey p. 40, 43f.). Cat. xxiii-xlii are added at the end of the smaller poems, i.e. after lx in Laur. 33, 13 and Ottobon. 1799 and 1982 (for a further possible example see below p. 45 n. 188). In R (ehdig. 125) Stat. *Silv.* II 1, 207 - II 2, 35 stand at end on f. 85v (Marastoni p. XIII, XXXV), Stat. *Ach.* I. 529-660, 662 are added at the end of the work (see Dilke 21f.; Marastoni IXf.). For Horace see below p. 35 n. 145. Cf. also [Tib.] III. xviii (= IV. xii) which is also found after III. vi. in A. For an example from prose cf. the codex A(genensis = Harl. 2493) of Livy; see the preface of Conway/ Walters p. xxxii.
From a Greek text one may cite the famous codex P(alatinus 23 + Paris, Suppl. gr. 384) of the *Anthologia Greaca* (conveniently accessible in the facsimile edition of Preisendanz in fasc. XV of *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice editi* [Leiden 1911]). This ms. is of particular interest since Cameron (97ff.) has recently shown that the scribes hitherto thought to belong to different periods of time are in fact contemporaries. Thus the composition of the ms. provides fascinating insights into the scribal habits of a larger team of scribes in the first half of the 10th century (for the date of the *Palatinus* see now Cameron 98). There the hand called B2 by Preisendanz (on the composition of the ms. cf. his extensive *prefatio* and now Cameron *loc. cit.*) adds XV. xxviii. 1-9, omitted before xxviii. 10, after XV. xli, *i.e.* where he ends the book (XV. xlii ff. are only added by a later hand). His colleague J, who often repairs lacunae left by A and B, wrote XV. i - xxvii, and he repeats xviii. 1-9 in the upper margin of the folium where B2 starts with xviii. 10.
In Par. gr. 2786 (ca. 1340) the annotation of Hesiod's *Works and Days* stops in the middle of the poem and the rest of the scholia (i.e. from v. 577 onward) are added—strangely enough—after the poetic text; this case is of some interest because at the end the scribe states explicitly: αὕτη ἡ cύνταξιc ἔcτι ἡ ὄπιcθεν ἀφεθεῖcα καὶ μετεθῆcα δι' ὃ τὰ νῦν τιθέαμεν εἴ πωc ἄρκιοc ᾖ ἡ βίβλοc καὶ μὴ τὰ μὲν ἔχουcα τὰ δὲ λειπομένη. Cf. also W. Jaeger, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Metaphysik des Aristoteles* (Berlin 1912) 14ff.; W.D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics* (Oxford 1924) xxxf.

[107] One may however cite Scaliger's transposition of Tib. I. v. 71-76 after vi. 32 which is supported by the imitation of vi. 7-32, v. 71-76 (in this order) in Ov. *Trist.* ii. 447-462. In this case the omitted passage appears to have been attached at the end of the preceding poem.

number of mss. (Hakanson's B, A and his class δ) append the first declamation at the very end. In another group (his VMπCDE) however it stands between 2 and 3.[108] The piece, obviously omitted by loss of the initial folia of the exemplar, has lost title and *argumentum*. As its topic is almost identical with that of 2 it may have reached this position because it was thought to be part of the same declamation as 2 and thus was added at the end of the latter.[109] In the mss. of Claudian we even find examples for partial restitution of the omitted passage[110], as we have to assume in the case of Propertius II. vi and xvi where the second poem is still incomplete even after the recovery of the missing portion from the first elegy.[111]

As regards the causes of the text losses in Propertius we cannot recognise any such reasons as *homoioteleuton* or *homoiarchon*, which might cause the respective passage to be omitted by oversight. The fragmentary condition of the text of book II suggests rather mechanic reasons for the losses of text. Thus we could explain the dislocation of vi. 35-42 by the assumption that they were caused by the loss of a complete folium. vi. 27-34 certainly cannot start a poem, and we must assume that the beginning of the poem went missing together with the concluding lines of its predecessor (1-26, 35-42[112]). Matters are a bit more complicated with II. xvi. I do not think that 31-42 can be regarded as a complete poem, but one cannot be certain whether a piece of text is lost at the beginning or at the end. xvi. 31 would certainly make a good start for a poem, but one could also suspect 41-42 to be the conclusion.[113] If a larger number of lines are lost before 31 the omission may again be due to the loss of a complete folium. If however 31 is the beginning of a poem just fourteen lines appear to have been lost between 30 and 31, surely too few for a folium. Curiously with xxviii. 33-46, where the complete text has been recovered the number of omitted lines is again fourteen. The text loss of this

[108] See Hakanson's edition (Stuttgart 1982), XI.

[109] Cf. also the title in M.

[110] See Hall, *DRP* 58 n. 2. One may also cite the famous *Floriacensis* of Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* where part of the passage omitted towards the end of book VIII is added at the end of the work; cf. the preface of Hering's edition (Leipzig 1987), p. X.

[111] The fragmentary condition of II. vi and xvi even after restoration of a missing portion makes the relegation of the restored passage to the end even more plausible. Surely it must have been very hard to find the correct position of the omitted passage if reference signs were lost, and even if they were not, the fact that the correct sequence would still fail to produce a satisfactory coherent text may well have led to doubt about the position of the restored passage.

[112] For 41-42 see below p. 120.

[113] If 31-42 form the end of a poem, there is no need to delete 41-42 (see above p. 26 n. 100); for a similar development of thought towards the conclusion cf. III. xi.

dimension could be explained as the omission of one page, which is certainly a less likely but not an unattested process[114], and I shall discuss some further indications for an ancestor of our text with fourteen lines per page later on.[115]

Before coming back to our initial case, II. xxiiB, let us assemble the other major dislocations in book II. A dislocation similar to these discussed above is seen in II. xxxii, although there the situation is more complicated and certainty about the text even less attainable. The poem is notorious for its various textual difficulties, and I shall discuss first the second half of the elegy.

No single problem of the text can be approached without regard to the overriding question whether and, if so, how the text from 25 onward has to be divided between two speakers, the poet and Cynthia.[116] Perhaps it is not completely impossible to interpret the whole poem as a monologue, but already the addresses *tu* 49 and *dic* in 55 seem slightly awkward if referred to an imaginary addressee. Almost insurmountable obstacles, however, are presented by 25f.: *sed tu non debes inimicae credere linguae* is preceded directly by an address to Cynthia in the preceding distich, and another address to her (with the bare possessive pronoun) follows in 27. Without change of speaker *tu* in 25 can only refer to Cynthia.[117] This appears to be impossible unless the text of 25 is emended, and Goold therefore prints Wakker's *cedere.*[118] Still, v. 25 as it stands seems perfectly natural in the mouth of Cynthia;[119] if, however, 25-30 are all spoken by the poet, his change of mind from jealousy to condoning nonchalance is rather abrupt and unconvincing. All fits much better if the poet only gives in to resigna-

---

[114] Cf. e.g. Lindsay 6 (on Mart. XI. ixxxiv -ixxxvi, omitted in β). For dislocations of single verses over one folium see O. Zwierlein, 'Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus (I)', *WJbb* 3 (1977), 172 f. Cf. also M. Schanz, 'Ueber den Platocodex Nr. 1807 der Nationalbibliothek in Paris (Parisinus A.)', *RhM* 33 (1878), 305f. for a possible omission of a column (in Par. gr. 1807 = A in Plato; cf. also recently Boter 80f. For a number of fourteen lines per page see Lowe I, 202, 271.

[115] See p. 159f.

[116] A similar case is III. vi as has been shown by J. L. Butrica, 'Propertius 3. 6', *Echos du Monde Classique* 27 (1983), 17-37. For a model of a dialogue without narrative frame in elegiac metre cf. Theogn. 579-582. For further examples from archaic Greek lyric see R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik, Zetemata* 44 (1967), 5ff. Cf. also Hor. *C.* III. ix (an erotic poem) and [Tib.] III. i with Tränkle's (Berlin - New York 1990) note.

[117] Butler-Barber (*ad loc.*) suggest translating *credere* by 'to take seriously'. This has been refuted by Shackleton Bailey 2, 127.

[118] *te* for *tu* is presumably a misprint.

[119] 25-26 certainly fit well in the mouth of the Cynthia who *contemnit murmura famae* in II. v. 29.

tion in 61f. after Cynthia herself has defended her behaviour by citing mythical precedents of sexual liberty. This, of course, entails that not only 25-26 or 25-30[120] but 25-60 as a whole are spoken by Cynthia, and there is indeed no convenient break for a change of speaker in the whole sequence.

The trouble is, of course, that 61-62 are clearly to be attributed to the poet, but a change of speaker after 60 appears to be impossible without assuming that something has been lost before 61. In addition there are still problems in the preceding speech of Cynthia as well: the distich 41-42 appears to be quite out of place where it stands. It should clearly refer to the situation in contemporary Rome and not to that of the mythical past referred to in 31-40[121], and seclusion or transposition after III. xiii. 12 was indeed suggested by Housman. Tentatively I venture to suggest the transposition of 31-40 after 60 and the assumption of a lacuna between 40 and 61 in which the end of Cynthia's speech and the beginning of the poet's answer are missing. Perhaps another lacuna should be considered between 30 and 41: the transition from 29f. to *in tanto stuprorum examine* in 41 is somewhat abrupt and, as we shall see later, a lacuna is strongly recommended by structural reasons.[122] Yet even if 41ff. follow directly upon 29-30, the background for a statement such as that of 41-2 is fairly clear and a lacuna not even strictly necessary.[123] In any case, the proposed transposition has the advantage of creating a consistent train of thought, which runs from the situation of contemporary Rome to the examples of sexual liberty from the mythical past.[124]

This case is parallel to the three dislocations discussed before, in so far as a longer passage from a poem had been lost and part of it was

---

[120] 25-26 and 31-60 were attributed to Cynthia by Postgate, 25-30 by Barber. If 27 is spoken by Cynthia, we have, of course, to write *mea* for *tua* with Barber. The corruption is particularly easy after the preceding *tu* in 25.

[121] Shackleton Bailey (2, 127) has pointed out that 42 echoes the style of Ciceronian invective (cf. *Cluent.* 124, *S. Rosc.* 74) and 45 refers to Clodia (Lesbia).

[122] See below p. 143f.

[123] 29-30 speak of Cynthia's *stupra*, i.e. of *stupra* in today's Rome and thus provide a tolerable background for 41ff.

[124] The transposition proposed creates a series of four mythical examples in a row counting fourteen verses: Pasiphae, Danae, Helen, Venus (57-60, 31-40); the longest in Propertius. However, this is special case: these examples are cited by Cynthia herself in a defence of her behaviour; quantity suits her point. Moreover a decided advantage of having 31ff. after 60 can be seen in the fact that with the transmitted order the two *exempla* Pasiphae and Danae alone strangely fail to illustrate the point about gods in 56 (*quae dea* [sc. *potuit*] *cum solo uiuere sola deo?*). In my text the insistence on divine examples of infidelity is aptly countered by the prominence given to the affairs of Venus in 33-40, who claims more lines than all other examples on mortal women together.

recovered later. In II. xxxii the restored portion was not relegated to the end but inserted in the wrong place. Superficially the passage fits only too well in its transmitted position and in contrast to the correct sequence the transmitted text even appears to offer a complete poem. Surely the passage did not reach this position mechanically but was inserted intentionally where it seemed to fit best. In fact the dislocation we shall discuss next in the same poem appears again to be due to a conscious choice, and I shall come back to intentional factors in the restoration of omitted portions of the text below in a larger context.[125]

The poem even exhibits a further dislocation in its earlier part. Goold has rightly accepted Hetzel's suggestion to transfer 7-10 before 1 and preserve the unity of xxxi and xxxii, only separated in 15th—century manuscripts.[126] The unity of xxxi and xxxii is strongly recommended by the Ovidian parallel *AA* i. 68ff., a passage distinctly echoing Propertius and bringing together the porticus of Pompeius (67) and the Palatine library (73f.[127]) as suitable places to meet girls.

Let us finally glance briefly at the last case for a major lacuna mentioned in our brief survey above: II. xxx A.[128] Most critics have considered the piece capable of standing on its own, and this is certainly not altogether impossible. I do feel however that a little more information about the concrete situation invoked by *quo fugis a demens?* (1) would be desirable; that the text of the poem is probably defective is also indicated by the lacuna after line 10, advocated for good reasons by Shackleton Bailey.[129] If xxx A is a fragment, this may help to solve one of the major *cruces* in Propertius: what are we to do with xxx. 19-22?[130] That these verses do not make any sense where they stand is best demonstrated by the absurd explanations which have been offered for them in their transmitted context.[131] But if they have

---

125 See p. 44ff.

126 See above p. 4 n. 8.

127 *tu modo Pompeia lentus spatiare sub umbra* (67) ... *nec tibi uitetur quae priscis sparsa tabellis/ porticus auctoris Liuia nomen habet,/ quaque parare necem miseris patruelibus ausae/ Belides et stricto stat ferus ense pater* (71ff.).

128 See below p. 58.

129 Cf. Shackleton Bailey 2, 124f.

130 For the vexed question of the variant readings in 19 see below p. 87f.

131 For a survey see Enk (II) p. 381ff., to which add F. Cairns, 'Propertius II 30 a and b', *CQ* 65 (1971), 204-213. The latter's interpretation (accepted by Fedeli, see his apparatus *ad loc.*) is subject to the criticism which Reeve advanced against E. N. O' Neil's ('Tibullus 2. 6: a New Interpretation', *CPh* [1967], 165ff.) interpretation of Tib. II. vi. 1-10 (see *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo* [Rome 1986], 62f.); even more so because in the Propertian context the allusion to epic poetry would come completely unprepared and would be most obscure and far fetched.

to be removed, where should they be placed? They certainly cannot find a place in xxx B; is there any place in xxx A? Carutti put them before line 1 and Housman followed him at least as regards 29-30.[132] Neither transposition is satisfactory if we regard the result as a complete poem,[133] but what if 29-32 and 1-12 are two fragments of the same poem, 29-32 belonging somewhere before 1-12 but not necessarily cohering directly with line 1? Again, among the verses lost from xxx A the two couplets which are now lines 29-32 might have been recovered later and wrongly inserted in the second part of what appeared to be one poem.

It appears that the end of the original book III was severely affected by mechanical damage to the text. We have found dislocations in II. xxx and II. xxxii and a large lacuna in xxxiii.[134] Even the concluding poem of the book, xxxiv, seems to have suffered. We shall see later that its text was affected by damage to single lines or parts of single lines,[135] but this elegy also presents the last case in book II of dislocations of passages longer than one distich. In two places a series of two couplets has to be transposed: 47-50 belong after 54 (Müller)[136], 77-80 after 66 (Ribbeck). Both transpositions are so patently correct that nobody who does not object to such transpositions in principle can fail to adopt them. Both have rightly been adopted in Goold's Loeb edition, and I do not print the text again in the appendix. Obviously these are far less radical changes than those advocated here for other elegies in book II, and for the second transposition, that of 77-80, there is an obvious cause for omission by oversight (*tu canis* in 77 and 67).

However the end of the book is not the only place where major lacunae occur *en masse*. II. xvi stands close to the lacuna between II. xviii. 4 and 5, and probably the whole sequence of poems xvi, xvii, xviii A, B, C is grossly disfigured by lacunae. If Housman's transposition of xxii B, advocated above, is correct, we have to reckon with a lacuna between xvii. 4 and 5, and I suspect that not only xviii A and

---

132 Lines 31-32 he transferred after I. xxii. 8.

133 Adherents of transposition have, of course, altered the text of v. 19. Most recently Goold, who follows Carutti, prints *num tu, dure, paras*. He regards the piece as a fragment (not only because of Shackleton Bailey's lacuna after 10, I assume), and he is certainly right. Not even with his text can 19-22 start the poem without any further supplement (who is the speaker, who the addressee?). Yet if the text is fragmentary we better suspend judgement as regards the text in v. 19.

134 See above p. 18f.

135 See below p. 159.

136 Vulpius put 51-4 after 58, but the two couplets 57-60 go closely together (*inter conviva ... hesternis ... corollis*).

B but also xviii C is defective. The lack of a clear train of thought after line 28 has long been recognised, and various transpositions of the distichs 29-30 and 31-32 have been proposed.[137] Yet no attempts to deal with the problems of the piece by such means are wholly satisfactory, because it seems impossible to mend the break in thought before 33; lines 33ff. introduce a theme quite different from the first ten lines (23-32).[138] It seems rather likely that between lines 28 and 33 a longer passage has been lost, a passage of which 29-32 are two scattered fragments.[139]

Let us now at long last come back to xxii B. If we try to understand the dislocation of xxii B on similar lines to those discussed above we could assume that at first xvii. 5-18 as well as the complete poems xviii A, B, C, xix, xx, xxi and xxii A were lost, resulting in the sequence xvii. 1-4, xxii B, xxiii. The loss of the last line of xxii B (i.e. 50) can well be seen as an interesting piece of evidence supporting the hypothesis that a lacuna does indeed lurk after xxii B. When the most part of the missing text was recovered (xxii B and xviii A/B/C are still incomplete) xxii B remained wrongly attached to xxiii. If a passage as long as xvii. 5-xxii. 42 had to be inserted into a codex, this will have required the addition of several leaves. Presumably then in a descendant of the ms. which had lost some folia between xxii B and xxiii the loss was ignored and xvii. 4 finished a *verso* and xxii B and xxiii occupied the same following *recto* -page, so that the insertion had to take place between xvii. 4 and xxii B rather than between xxii B

[137] Neither Lachmann's transposition of 31-32 (printed by Goold) after 26 nor Baehrens's after 28 (defended by P. J. Enk, 'Dislocation of Couplets in the Mss. of Propertius', *Mnemosyne* IV 9 (1956), 145ff.) is convincing. *Deme* (29) is unacceptable with the verse in its transmitted position (it is certainly wrong to read *de me* , which Butler-Barber justly describe as "clumsy"). Goold has recently accepted Baehrens's *desine*, surely the best proposal, if emendation were called for; but *deme* looks genuine. Enk (*loc. cit.*) has rightly pointed out that the word can stand if the line stood after 31f.; thus *deme* may refer to *fuco*. The transposition is unsatisfactory, but it seems rather likely that *deme* does indeed refer to a similar antecedent.

[138] Not so much the last couplet (37-38), which was thought alien to the context by Housman, but rather the whole passage 33-38 is only very vaguely connected with what precedes. "Ohne formalen Übergang, in der Weise, wie ein künstlich zurückgehaltenes Gefühl trotzdem hervorbricht, knüpft der Dichter an die besondere Forderung in einer einzelnen Sache die allgemeine Mahnung, auf die es ihm wesentlich ankommt", is Rothstein's comment on 33. Psychological explanation of this kind is a good indication that something has gone wrong with the text.
Goold reintroduces the topic of cosmetics in v. 35 with his conjecture *uultus* for *lectus* (4, 301). I fail to see the point of his objection to *lectus* , which is perfectly intelligible and has been correctly explained by commentators, e.g. Butler-Barber *ad loc.*

[139] One may even find the sequence 33-38 puzzling and Dr. Heyworth tells me that he intends to print the lines as three scattered distichs. Cf. also the apt remarks in Fedeli's apparatus on vv. 29-38.

and xxiii. Thus either xxii B was extant twice in our codex, before xvii. 5 and before xxiii, and, for some reason, was later deleted in the wrong place,[140] or the scribe refrained from copying xxii B after xvii. 4 and was content to refer xxii B to its correct place by a sign of reference, and this sign may, of course, easily have been lost in the course of transmission.

This may appear to be a rather complex and speculative explanation of what might have happened, and one certainly would not like to resort to such hypotheses too often; I do think however that it is admissible to invoke an exceptional explanation in one exceptional case. Moreover, such an assumption may seem less speculative when one realises that there is again supporting evidence for similar processes from documented cases. If the restoration of a longer passage of text requires the insertion of one or more folia and does not occur in the very ms. affected by prior loss of folia but in a subsequent copy of a defective ms. the insertion can never take place at the exact point of the loss of text, provided that the copy does not reproduce faithfully the arrangement of the text in the exemplar. In order to avoid duplication or disturbances of the sequence of text one may of course chose not only to insert folia carrying the missing portions but to replace at the same time the original folium in which the omission occurs. Various methods of restoring missing portions of text in the middle of a folium can be studied in the Apollonian part of the famous Laur. pl. 32, 9 (L in Sophocles and Apollonius Rhodius, M in Aeschylus).[141] Here we find the addition of longer portions of text in the margin (fol. 236^r), replacement of folia carrying defective portions of text (fol. 256[142] and 260) and the insertion of a folium after the folium which carries a defective text (fol. 253 with vv. iv. 852-973 between 252^v, which ends with v. 975 with vv. 852-951 missing and 952-975 crossed out, and 254^r which starts with 976 with 974f. added above the column). Moreover we can again cite a ms. of Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae*, Leiden. 395 (13th cent., Hall's J2); there a second hand adds on f. 49 iii. 280-360 which thus stand between iii. 250 and 251.[143] In four other mss., Laur. pl. 91 sup. 34, Pesaro, Biblioteca

---

140 Cf. Courtney 3, 13ff.

141 See F. Vian in the preface of vol. I of his Budé edition (Paris 1974), XLVf.

142 In this case the restoration still leads to duplication, see Vian *loc. cit.*

143 Cf. Hall, *DRP* 13, 58 n. 2. Similar cases occur in Statius' *Achilleid* and *Thebaid*: in *Par.* 10317 (I have inspected the ms. personally but cf. also Klotz' apparatus and his preface p. XXV) *Ach.* vv. 529-661 are omitted in the upper half of fol. 173v (vv. 525-8, 663-687), and v. 662 has been erased. 529-662 are added on an inserted leaf (f. 174; i.e. between 687 and 688) and referred to their rightful place by a cross. Another example is the codex E(rlangensis 848 Irmscher, 380 Fischer; 10th century,

Oliveriana 18 (16th cent.), Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale 247 and 633 (Hall's F6, k, Y1 and Y2), III. 332-60 stand after iii. 388.[144] Presumably they descend from a ms. where a page break occurred between 388 and 389 and a leaf with 332-360 was inserted shortly after the actual loss of text. A particularly interesting case is Laur. pl. 91 sup. 4 (15th cent., Hall's F11), which offers the sequence iii. 279 (+ the spurious verse interpolated to mend the break after omission of 280-360), 362-3 (in brackets), 281-363etc.; 280 is added in the margin. This seems constitute an exact parallel to my hypothesis for Propertius II. xxiiB. Presumably the arrangement of F11 goes back to a ms. where a folium was inserted after a page break after 363. In order to match the beginning of the following folium 362-3 where copied again on the insertion. 280 alone was added in the margin (near 279 I assume), presumably in order to make clear that it is an alternative to the interpolation after 279, and does not continue the text.[145]

1.2. *Minor Transpositions in II. xvi A*

As has been mentioned above,[146] there are various problems in the first half of the poem which have led to numerous transpositions of single couplets, and some thirty years ago Sandbach in a highly stimulating treatment of the elegy[147] even proposed to introduce, in addition to Fontein's transposition of 11-12 after 16, poem division before 15. Arguing again for Fontein's transposition, Sandbach did indeed hit upon the foremost, or at least the most obvious problem of the transmitted order. There can hardly be any doubt that the verse order is disturbed between 11 and 18 and that the couplets 11-12 and

---

restored in the 15th century) of Cicero's *De oratore*; cf. H. Fischer, *Die lateinischen Pergamenthandschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen* (Erlangen 1928), p. 451. Cf. also O. L. Smith, 'Tricliniana II', *ClM* 43 (1992), 189f. n. 12 (on the Aeschylean part of Vat. gr. 920) and below n. 145.

144 Cf. Hall, *DRP* 8, 14, 32, 58 n. 2.

145 For another documented example of how a later insertion of a lost passage of some length can lead to duplication one may compare the Horatian ms. Monacensis lat. 14685 (C/E ; see C.O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry II, The 'Ars Poetica'* [Cambridge 1971], 4-6); cf. also Zwierlein 69 (with pl. 2 and 3): Sen. *HO* 182-225 were originally omitted in E and later added on a separate folium which is now inserted in the wrong place. E 's descendant F presents the passage twice; in its rightful place and, with the addition of one line, before the whole play. Cf. also p. 27 n. 106 above (on [Tib.] III. xviii and P in the *Anthologia Graeca*).

146 See p. 26.

147 *PCPhS* NS 5 (1958-1959), 3ff.

17-18 belong together. Yet it is clear that Fontein's transposition alone is still far from producing a satisfactory result and one will of course hesitate to resort to too complicated a series of transpositions to solve *one* problem of the transmitted text: hence Sandbach's division before v. 15, a remedy which, after what has been said above about the authority of the poem divisions of the mss.,[148] can hardly be regarded as an interference with the transmission at all.

Certainly, 13-14 fit fairly well as a concluding couplet but nonetheless Sandbach's solution is unsatisfactory on several counts. First of all, we have pointed out above[149] that 1-30, 43-56 (=xvi A) and 31-42 (=xvi B) form a dramatic pair, and it would be unwelcome to split up this complex further. More important is the fact that 1-10, 13-14 are rather unconvincing as a complete poem on their own and 7-12[150] and 15ff. clearly form a thematic unity[151] which should not be torn apart. Moreover, Fontein's transposition is unsatisfactory in itself. The natural order for the two connected distichs 11-12 and 17-18 is not 17-18, 11-12 but rather 11-12, 17-18, and 11-12 is well placed after 9-10, where it is transmitted; moreover 15-16, not 11-12, are suited to lead to the more general topic expounded in 19ff. In fact the sequence 9-12, 17-18, 15-16, 19ff.[152] is clearly the obvious one for a consistent development of thought from Cynthia's avarice to the damaging effect of luxury on women's morals. Cynthia, you may well take advantage of the poor fellow who thinks he has conquered you, the poet remarks sarcastically (7-8), because he will soon be due to lose you again when his wealth is exhausted (9-10). Cynthia treats her lovers this way, money is the only thing she is after (11-12); yes, the poet himself has to buy his mistress in order to possess her (17-18). Is it not the case that obviously everybody is able to buy his love, if only the price is right (15-16)? Oh, if only there were no such luxuries in Rome to corrupt women in this way (19ff).

---

148 See p. 4ff.

149 See p. 26.

150 Apart from the special case II. xi (see above p. oo), xvi. 1-10, 13-14 would also be by far the shortest elegy in the second book.

151 Cf. the paraphrase below. Sandbach's claim that *barbarus* (27) cannot mean the *praetor* of v. 1 has been answered by Enk *ad loc.* Goold in his edition aptly refers to the end of the second poem of Goethe's *Römische Elegien.*

152 Thus rightly Housman. The transposition of 17-18 after 11-12 is also accepted by Goold. The change from *dic* (10) to *Cynthia* (11) is not, in my opinion, a reason to suspect the verse order between 9 and 12. After his outburst in 9f. the poet suddenly becomes aware that his cynical remarks about Cynthia's treatment of the new lover are only too true of her behaviour with lovers in general, including her relationship with the poet himself. With the change of address the tone changes from angry cynicism, provoked by the present situation, to melancholic general reflections.

The couplet, obviously, which still does not fit in is 13-14, and it is very hard to tolerate it in the middle of this excursus on chastity and wealth, whatever the order of 11ff. Odd as it may seem, I cannot see another remedy but to remove this distich and thus opt for a double transposition. There are indeed several places where 13-14 would fit fairly well. Housman put it after 28, certainly an obvious collocation as regards the preceding distich if one reads *excussis*[153] there. This transposition, however, does not suit the following couplet, and 13-14 would not even fit in before 43 if one is inclined towards accepting Carutti's transposition of 29-30 after 46. Another possibility would be to transpose 13-14 after v.4, where the couplet might even have a special point rather suited to the touch of humour so prominent in the whole piece[154]: If Neptune missed his chance to earn the poet's gratitude (3-4), at least Venus may come to his aid (13-14). Yet one may feel that the rather drastic wish expressed in 14 would follow somewhat abruptly after 4, when only the arrival of Cynthia's new lover has been mentioned[155] so far, and it would certainly fit much better after the fellow's doings with Cynthia had already been described in some detail. Moreover the connection between 13-14 and 27-28 is so obvious that one would indeed like to see the two couplets stand in close proximity. I wonder whether we should not place 13-14 immediately before 27. The transition from 26 to 27 is not very pleasant, and to have 13-14 after 26 would be a decided improvement.

The double transposition proposed may be acceptable if we remind ourselves that it occurs in a poem which is affected anyway by mechanical losses of text, and perhaps the text of the poem was so damaged not only after v. 30 but in its first half as well. One may guess that 13-14 and 15-16 were lost in their original place; when the two couplets were recovered and integrated into the text they

---

[153] I still think that Shackleton Bailey's explanation (2, 95) of the line is patently correct (not the amended version which Enk (*ad loc.*) cites from a communication *per litteras*. In particular, I cannot find Sandbach's objection to the lack of *decorum* in the expression *excussis lumbis* convincing. While it is absolutely true that Roman elegists before Ovid are remarkably reticent as to sexual detail, there are obvious exceptions, not least the previous elegy II. xv. *lumbis* is vulgar anyway (see Tränkle 1, 120) and *excussis lumbis* is defended, I would say rendered as good as certain, by v. 14 (hardly less direct; for the language see Tränkle 1, 137), and the strikingly drastic phrase fits the humour of the poem very well. Sandbach's own conjecture *exutis* (accepted by Goold) is based on his interpretation of *barbarus* , on which see above p. 36 n. 151.

[154] Cf. E. Lefèvre, *Propertius ludibundus* (Heidelberg 1966), 65-71, 136f.

[155] This collocation could, however, be defended as a particularly comic effect.

wrongly remained attached to each other and were inserted close to the original position of 15-16, i.e. after v.12.[156]

1.3 *Further Cases of Wholesale Transposition in Books III and IV*

Outside the second book I know of two elegies where wholesale transposition of several passages has plausibly been suggested: III. vii and IV. ii. In both these poems the Loeb edition of Goold ventures to print a radically altered order, and in the second case I fully agree with his text.

III. vii appears to present more serious problems with the transmitted order than any other elegy of Propertius. The problems may even seem so overwhelming and complicated that one will, at first sight, be tempted to despair completely. But even if the problems of the piece admit even less certain solutions than the other cases discussed so far, let us see how far we can get now that we have abandoned the general prejudice against resorting to wholesale transposition.

For a start, we may pick out of the large number of transpositions proposed in the past one of the oldest, indeed one suggested by the archegete of the method, the great J.J.Scaliger. He placed 21-24, undoubtedly impossible in their present position,[157] after 36, L.

---

[156] For another example of the same process cf. Sen. Tr. 815ff.; in addition to Richter's transposition of 816-818 after 822 Zwierlein rightly places 820 after 841 (cf. 'Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus [III]', *WJbb* 5 [1979], 172). Obviously 819, 821-2 and 820 were lost (the first three lines surely because of homoioarchon) and later inserted together between 818 and 823. For a further case in Propertius see below p. 43.

[157] As an alternative to transposition deletion or a lacuna has been proposed (cf. Smyth *ad loc.*; for Shackleton Bailey's solution see below). As regards text and interpretation of the difficult lines I agree with Shackleton Bailey (2, 150f.). Hertzberg's *Athamantiadae* seems to me quite likely (accepted also by Goold); names, especially rare ones like this, are easily corrupted (cf. Willis 173ff.). The phenomenon is so widespread that it is unnecessary to cite examples (it is particularly well known in the transmission of Martial; cf. W. Heraeus, 'Zur neueren Martialkritik', *RhM* 74 [1925], 318ff., M. D. Reeve in *TT* 243; for examples from Ovid cf. Dörrie III 314ff.); as regards Propertius I only wish to point out that the notorious *crux* in I. xii. 2 is probably also due to this kind of corruption, and I think Fedeli has rightly accepted Kraffert's and Wilamowitz's *Pontice* for the transmitted *conscia*. Equally Phillimore's *Marcellus* for *his pressus* is surely right in III. xviii. 9, and his *Patriciae* for *Tarpeiae* in I. xvi. 2 is palmary (both emendations of Phillimore have been accepted by Goold; cf. Goold 2, 33 and 4, 307f.); for other less obvious examples cf. also II. viii. 30 (*Teucris* Housman for *tectis*) and xxvi. 23 (Schrader's *iam Gygae* for *Cambysae* is very likely, see Enk *ad loc.*).

Müller prefers to put them after 38, and he has been followed by Fedeli.[158] Both transpositions seem, at first sight, equally possible, and there can hardly be any doubt that the obvious place for the lines is somewhere after 35ff. Let us for the moment leave open the decision for Scaliger or Müller and consider first some other problems of the transmitted order.

The lack of acceptance for Scaliger's or Müller's transposition may be explained not only by the understandable reluctance of editors to resort to wholesale transposition, but also by the fact that, however perfectly 21-24 may fit between 36-37 or 38-39, this transposition does not solve all the problems of the passage from which 21-24 are removed; 25 certainly cannot stand after v. 20. In fact, 17-20 are in any case awkward where they are transmitted.[159] But what if 17-24 as a whole are removed? 13-16 are certainly the obvious antecedent of 25ff. For 21-24 Scaliger and Müller may compete as regards their original place. We are left only with the question where to put 17-20. One may first think of connecting the passage somehow with Paetus' speech 57ff., and indeed several attempts have been made to join the two passages. It will suffice here to discuss the most recent rearrangement printed in Goold's edition.

Goold, following Postgate and Scaliger, puts 43-66 after v. 8[160]; in addition he transposes 17-18 before 9 (i.e. after 66), and 67-70 stand between 16 and 25. 19-22 he removes with Richardson to follow

---

158 Cf. his note *ad loc.*

159 "It is far from clear who are addressed in *reddite* (25); the only suitable names which have preceded are Aquilo and Neptune (13, 15), and it is a far cry from 15 to 25", Butler-Barber p. 276. Apart from this the problem with 17-20 is not so much that these verses anticipate Paetus' speech in 57ff. but that they follow rather abruptly after 16. Especially awkward seems to me a third vocative *Paete* after the address to Aquilo and Neptunus when 17ff. introduce a new twist of thought and Paetus is not on the same level as Aquilo and Neptunus. Vahlen's attempt ('Über die Paetus—Elegie des Propertius', *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin* [1883] iii, 73f. = *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften*, Leipzig - Berlin 1923, II, 160f.) to justify *reddite* as an invocation of the waves needs a vocative, as has rightly been pointed out by Shackleton Bailey (151), who contemplates P. H. Damste's ('Propertiana', *Mnemosyne* 52 [1924], 414; also E. H. Alton, 'Temptamina Propertiana', *Hermathena* 49 [1935], 47-51) *aquae* for *humo* (for another solution cf. F. H. Sandbach, 'Notes on Propertius II 16 and III 7', *PCPhS* 5 [1958-9], 3-5) but then opts for a lacuna which he obviously thinks could provide both a vocative for 25 and a context for 21-24. But then surely a lacuna of one distich, as he thinks, would be too short. As there is an obvious place for 21-24 in the poem, transposition is, at least for this passage, more likely than a lacuna. One may however contemplate a lacuna between 20 and 25, caused by or in some way connected with the intrusion of 21-24.

160 In recent times T. Walsh ('Propertius' Paetus elegy [3. 7], *LCM* 12 [1987], 66-9) also opted for this arrangement.

36.[161] Against this text the following objections can be raised: there is nothing wrong with the sequence 17-20, which Goold and Richardson split up. On the contrary, 19-20 fit much better after 17-18 than where Richardson put them. 21-24 should follow 36 directly, as was seen by Scaliger.[162] Moreover, Goold's text fails to provide a vocative for *reddite* (25) and he has to resort to conjecture there[163], but surely one should expect the right transposition to solve this problem as well. In fact, the obvious antecedent for *reddite* stands in our text, and, as I have said above, all is well with 25 if 17-24 as a whole are removed; and why not put 17-20 alone between 8-9? Not that 9-10 do not stand well after 7-8, but do they not fit even better after Paetus' call for his mother has been mentioned? In any case, *natat* (8)—*natanti* (17) and *mater* (18)—*mater* (9) would account for the loss of 17-20 between 8 and 9.

In spite of its shortcomings as regards 17-24 Goold's text has other merits. He appears to be alone among modern editors in appreciating the insurmountable problems of the passage 43-50 in its transmitted place: the transition from 42 to 43, with the sudden change of the subject from Ulixes to Paetus, is simply impossible.[164] Certainly there is nothing wrong with 43 following 8; yet there is an easier solution for the problem of 42/3: Why not put 43-6 after 66 with Heyworth? 47 fits perfectly well after 42 if we accept Barber's *nunc*, and Heyworth's *et* for *hoc/haec* is also highly likely.[165] The sequence 51-54 may further be affected by a minor disturbance: Smyth's[166] transpo-

---

[161] He further exchanges 51 and 53 with Fischer and follows Jacob in deleting 23-24. Neither seems necessary to me, but in any case this does not affect the overall picture.

[162] Moreover, one may find 17-18 awkwardly repetitive after 57ff.

[163] He accepts Damste's *aquae* (see above p. 39 n. 159), but I do not find his objection to *humo* convincing.

[164] "The omission of the name is not a serious difficulty after a moralising parenthesis such as 29-42", Butler-Barber, but 13 lines is a very long way to look back for the subject. It is surprising that nobody appears to have suggested a lacuna. The clever conjecture of Lachmann *o si* does at least something to mend the break but is surely not fully convincing.

[165] The explanations of the transmitted text by B. L. Gildersleeve ('Propertius III 7, 47 - 50', *AJPh* 4 [1883], 210) and Camps put an unacceptable strain on the language, but even the interpretation of W. R. Smyth ('Interpretationes Propertianae', *CQ* 45 (1951), 75-7; approved by Shackleton Bailey 153) is unconvincing. Emendation should certainly not eliminate *tulit* which is highly appropriate (Heyworth refers to I. viii. 5-8); Barber's *nunc* for *non* is so obvious that one can only wonder why it was not suggested before.

[166] *loc. cit.* 77; it seems to me preferable to Fischer's exchange of 51 and 53 and I fail to see the point of Fedeli's (*ad loc.*) objection: why must 54 have "valore conclusivo" and not rather prepare for 51-52? I find the sequence 52/ 55 rather attractive.

sition of 51-52 after 53-54 has obvious attractions, though I do not find it strictly necessary.

With this considerations in mind we can now return to the question postponed above: in placing 21-24 should we rather follow Scaliger or Müller? Certainly, 21-24 fit particularly well after *portus* in 36,[167] but what about the further mythical *exempla* in 39-42? Do they really fit after 37-38? Are they apt for illustrating the topic of *avaritia*, mentioned in 37-38? No: *avaritia* applies to Paetus, not to the mythical *exempla*. And surely we expect the three *exempla*, all connected with the Greek expedition to Troy, to form one uninterrupted series. 37-38 probably belong directly after 42; *insidians* in 37 well refers to *doli* in 42. 47ff. follow as well after 38 as they do after 42.

Interestingly enough there is a further case for transposition quite similar to those discussed above from book II in the poem following directly upon III. vii. The end of elegy III. viii (35-40) has long been suspected of not forming part of the same poem. While it is not wholly impossible to regard 37-40 as finally supplying the true background of the quarrel between the poet and his lover, i.e. the scheming of a rival for Cynthia's favour,[168] one will feel at least some discomfort about 35-36 in their present position. The couplet introduces a new twist of thought hardly connected with what precedes,[169] only to lead immediately to still another topic, that of the rival and his schemes.

The second major problem of the elegy is posed by the couplet 25-6, which has been felt disruptive in its transmitted position[170] since the days of Guyet and Dorville. Deletion or transposition has been suggested since then by various scholars,[171] but I wonder whether the problems of 35-40 and that of 25-6 may not be connected. 34 would certainly be a possible end of a poem, but 35-40 are hardly capable of

---

167 This was correctly pointed out by Scaliger in his note on the passage: "recte hic haec traduximus. Modo enim dixit:—*fallit portus et ipse fidem.*" This is one of the few cases where Scaliger reveals his reasons for a particular transposition.

168 Thus Jacoby in his classic interpretation of the poem, Jacoby 445; cf. also J. L. Butrica in 'Propertius 3. 8: Unity and Coherence', *TAPA* 111 (1981), 23-30 for the best defence of unity which can be made. His paper is particularly valuable for its convincing refutation of prior interpretations of the poem.

169 Butler-Barber's (*ad loc.*) attempt to connect the thought of 35-6 with what precedes is most unconvincing and strained. Cf. also Heyworth 3, 205.

170 The close coherence between 23-4 and 27-8 speaks decisively against the lacuna of Müller and Baehrens after 24 (advocated again by Butrica *op. cit.* [n. 168], 27).

171 Cf. Jachmann, 'Verswiederholung in der Augusteischen Dichtung' in: *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli* (Firenze 1955) 421; more recently Butrica 85 and Heyworth 3, 205.

standing by themselves, quite apart from the fact that such an epigram in the middle of the elegy book would be most unlikely.[172] Rather 35-40 are a fragment of the poem following upon III. viii, presumably the end of it, since 37-40 clearly have the typical ring of a Propertian conclusion.[173] I suspect that 25-6 are part of the same poem as 35-40, even if they do not cohere directly with 35.

As I have said above, I fully agree with Goold's text in IV. ii. It seems to me so convincing that it hardly needs further discussion[174]. Both in IV. ii and in III. vii the process of dislocation, though restricted to one single poem in each case, is certainly too complicated to allow a plausible reconstruction of the process of corruption. It is, however, worth making the following observations on the transmitted order in IV. ii, since this may throw some further light on the even more complicated case of III. vii: two major dislocations have affected IV. ii: 49-56 belong after 4 (with the further transposition of 49-50 after 54)[175] and 13-18 belong after 42 (Heyworth). It is hard to see why the two passages were omitted if not for mechanical reasons[176] but in any case the order in which we read the verses now does not appear to have come about by pure chance. 13-18 were without much doubt placed intentionally where we read them now.

---

[172] See above p. 18. One may, of course, argue that 35-40 may still be part of the same poem, if we assume a major lacuna before 35, and one could regard the allusion to rivalry in 33 as a proper preparation for 37-40. Yet 33-34 are quite convincing as the end of a poem, and too long an appendix of different topics after 34 appears to spoil somehow the unity and dramatic vehemence of the poem. Moreover, the hint at rivalries in love of lines 33-34 could equally well prepare for a second poem on a similar topic.

[173] Cf. I. xiii. 33-36, xviii. 25-28, II. xviii. 19-20, xxviii. 59-62, xxxiii. 21-22.

[174] Cf. the text printed below in the appendix p. 64.

[175] This was already seen by Housman 38.

[176] Both passages are of similar length, i.e. the first contains eight, the second six lines. Their omission in the original place may be due to mechanical damage to the upper or lower margin of the same folium, damage which affected two lines more on the *recto* than on the *verso*. The two passages are 32 lines apart; depending on whether we reckon with damage to the lower or to the upper margin, we have to assume a page of 38 or 40 lines (i.e. 32 + 6 or 32 + 8 lines).
A famous parallel for the process is offered by Lachmann's reconstruction of the archetype of Lucretius, in which the top right hand corner of one folium must have been torn away causing the loss of text in I. 1068ff. and after 1093; see Bailey I p. 37, and cf. also G. P. Goold, 'A Lost Manuscript of Lucretius', *Acta Classica* 1 (1958), 21ff. (against K. Büchner, 'Präludien zu einer Lukrezausgabe', *Hermes* 84 [1956], 198ff.; repeated in his edition [Wiesbaden 1966], XI n. 11). The behaviour of QG, where the mutilated lines 1068-75 are omitted, also offers a parallel for our assumption that illegibility of part of the text may sometimes have led to complete omission.
Lucretius also provides a parallel for the missing line ends in N of Propertius (see below p. 67ff).

When the lines were recovered a redactor thought fit to insert them at the first point where the context admitted it, i.e. after the reference to *fructum* in 11-12. In fact, the redactor was clever enough to mislead scholars for centuries to come. An element of intentional change may also be observed in the transposition of 49-50 between 48 and 51. The sequence 49-56 after 48 may have come about by chance but 49-50 appear to have been transposed after 48 in order to produce an intelligible text.[177]

In fact intentional transposition has already been suspected in III. vii by Goold, and I shall come back to his hypothesis in a moment. Surely in the first part of III. vii again the transmitted sequence of verses seems not to be due to chance.[178] Presumably the two omitted passages 17-20 and 21-24 were added together in the margin (a similar process we have suspected above in II. xvi[179]). Exactly as in IV. ii, a redactor tried to fit in the passage in the earliest position which occurred to him. The first place where he thought he could connect 17ff. was after 16. He might have thought fit to add the address *Paete* in 17 to the series of vocatives in 13-16 and did not bother to check whether 25 fits after 24. The correct position of 17-20 earlier in the poem probably escaped him because he was cautious not to introduce a change of address after v. 8. We may also remember the transposition of II. xxxii. 31-40 discussed above.[180] Here too the missing portion appears to have been inserted in the first place were it makes sense.

1.4. *Intentional Transposition and the Dislocation of Single Couplets*

As I said at the beginning, the most important stimulus in recent times for the study of dislocations in the Propertian corpus has been the work of G.P. Goold. In the text of his admirable Loeb edition he hosts more transpositions than any other editor since Carutti and Richmond, including his more recent forerunner Richardson. I have already discussed above Goold's radical rearrangement of III. vii and IV. ii; however, in contrast to the dislocations of longer passages argued in the preceding chapters, Goold's edition distinguishes itself rather by its receptiveness towards transpositions of single couplets, and III. vii and IV.ii, and to a smaller extent II. xxx and xxxiv,[181] are

---

[177] For parallels for the process cf. below p. 44f.
[178] See below p. 44.
[179] See above p. 37f.
[180] See p. 29ff.
[181] See above p. 31f. On II. ii. 9-12 see below p. 46f.

the only elegies where Goold resorts to transposition of longer passages. Primarily, the audacity of his text lies in the large number of transpositions he accepts, but besides this he even ventures to print some transpositions of single couplets over very long distances, even from one book to another.

Goold also is the first modern editor of Propertius who advances an explanation of his more radical transpositions which deserves serious consideration.[182] In his discussion of the major dislocations in III. vii[183] he suspects that the transmitted sequence of couplets is partly due to intentional transposition by a redactor who tried to mend the faults of a text after the inversion of a folium. Such intentional interference with the order is perfectly plausible, and in spite of my different rearrangement of the poem I have argued for similar processes here and elsewhere.[184] In fact, phenomena such as I have tried to illustrate above are by no means unheard of in other authors. In Propertius we could even observe certain patterns of dealing with a disturbed verse order. Not only may verses be transposed intentionally to create a somehow intelligible text; even in the insertion of lost verses from the margin a certain element of intentional choice is highly likely in itself and can be documented abundantly.

First of all, to my experience dislocated verses do not normally disrupt the syntax in their transmitted position as severely as one might expect if they got in the wrong place by pure chance. Very often they even fit superficially into the context. As regards documented examples of dislocation it may be enough to refer to some cases which I shall discuss below[185]: Hom. *Od.* i. 93ab have hardly been inserted by chance after 102 in R, and the same applies to *Od.* xi. 604 after 626, Ov. *Her.* xvi. 168ab after 174, in order to cite only a few examples where the dislocation occurs over a considerable space.[186] As a particularly obvious case I add only Sen. *Tr.* 587;

---

182 See Goold 3, 106ff. and pp. 22f. of his edition.

183 See above p. 38ff.

184 See pp. 42ff above.

185 Pp. 115ff.

186 In order to illustrate the phenomenon further I pick out at random a few instances from Euripides: examples for the insertion of dislocated verses in the first place where they fit can be seen e.g. at E. *Alc.* 144f. (post 149 Lueders), *Hcld.* 402 (post 409 Diggle), *El.* 1107f. (post 1131 Weil), 1295-7 (post 1302 Arnoldt), *HF* 860 (post 870). A further pattern of dislocations which appears to indicate an element of intentional choice consists in placing a verse close to another which contains the same or a similar word; cf. e.g. E. *Cycl.* 392 (post 385 Paley), *Hcld.* 948f. (post 952 Wilamowitz). E. *Andr.* 73 (post 69 Radermacher) may have been inserted after 72 for reasons of symmetry (two lines for each speaker). More complicated dislocations such as e.g. *HF* 1184, 1187f., 1186, 1185, 1189etc. presuppose in all probability an element of intentional interference with the verse order.

insert the dislocated verse (post 573 Zwierlein) after 581. An especially well documented phenomenon is the transposition of verses in order to integrate interpolated parallel versions into the genuine text without eliminating the original, which the latter were supposed to replace, and I dealt with a few examples some time ago.[187] However, it should be noted that in all cases where editorial activity may reasonably be suspected behind disturbances of the verse order, it is provoked by either mechanical dislocation or other disturbances of the text in the first place. I do not know of any plausible case of interference with the genuine verse order as such,[188] and the two examples which Goold[189] adduces from Propertius (II. iii. 11f. and IV. viii. 19f.) do not convince me at all. In one case Goold is right in accepting the transposition,[190] but I cannot believe that anyone could ever have felt tempted to alter the natural order restored by the transpositions printed by Goold in order to create the awkward sequence of the transmission.[191] Single couplets may easily be omitted by oversight, even if there are no obvious reasons such as *homoioteleuton*

---

[187] See Günther 2, 52f., 56. Cf. also E. Fraenkel, 'Ein Motiv aus Euripides in einer Szene der neuen Komödie', in: *Studi in onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli*, Firenze 1955, 302f.; Ludwich 105. For an example from Latin poetry cf. e.g. Ov. *Met.* i. 544a-547a.

[188] Intentional transposition of lines is ascribed to Zenodotus and Aristarchus in the Homeric scholia (*schol. Ariston.* ad Hom. *Il.* vii. 482, viii. 1, 53: Zenodotos transfers viii. 1 between viii. 52 and 53; ad *Il.* xviii. 174-5: Zenodotus transfers xviii. 176-7 after 155) and Athenaeus (181C: Aristarchus transfers *Od.* iv. 17-18 from their position after *Il.* xviii. 604a to the Odyssey), but surely on the basis of ms. evidence; not even K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesus* (Berlin-New York 1977), 202f. finds convincing reasons for conjectural transference. That Aristonikos' references to transpositions are pure fictions, designed to explain divergent ms. evidence, is shown by *schol. Arist.* ad *Il.* iii. 423 and v. 194, where in reality no transposition at all is involved (on these passages cf. also Nickau 123ff., 187ff.
Intentional relocation of a larger unit is however attested in Catullus: the fragment lviiib is inserted after lv. 12 in several copies, and a similar location has indeed been favoured even by modern scholars. Here the fragmentary state of the text which in our tradition is wrongly united with lviiia accounts for the difficulty which prompted interference. It seems even possible that lviiib is a loose fragment which was inserted at the end of a sequence of phalacean poems in the vulgate (for this process see above p. 27f.) whereas the location in a minority of witnesses represents an attempt to find a sensible place for the passage.
For an attempt by a medieval redactor to relocate a dislocated verse cf. also Sen. *Tro.* 587 after 581; cf. Zwierlein 90, 106.

[189] Goold (ed.) 21f.

[190] II. iii. 11f. after 16 (Housman), wrongly; for IV. viii. 19f. after 2 (Lütjohann) see below p. 126f.

[191] As regards IV. viii. 19f. it is completely out of the question that anyone should have bothered to engage in the oversubtle interpretation of 1-2, 19-20, advanced by Goold, only in order to create the nonsense of 19-20 in their transmitted position. For my explanation of the dislocation see below p. 126f. For II. iii. 11-12 see my paper in *SBAW*.

or *homoioarchon*; in order to justify the transposition of a single couplet in one poem we need not devise sophisticated explanations of the process.

Of special interest is Goold's attempt to revive bolder transpositions of single couplets (or, in one case, even of two couplets together) over long distances. His starting point is the famous infamous interpolation of I. ii. 1f. after IV. v. 54.[192] It has always been suspected that the couplet was incorporated into IV. v from a marginal comment, inspired presumably by *Coae ... uestis* in IV. v. 57.[193] Goold thinks that the same has happened elsewhere, and that later the duplication was removed, but in the wrong place. In fact, this theory had already been advanced by Courtney in his admirable paper on quotation, interpolation and transposition,[194] and he has shown convincingly that similar processes can be documented elsewhere. I would not hesitate to adopt a similar explanation for Housman's transposition of III. ix. 33f. after II. i. 38, advocated emphatically by Courtney and accepted also by Richardson and Goold, if I were convinced of it on internal grounds. It seems, however, rather unlikely to me that such faulty deletions of duplications should have occurred more than once or twice; in particular, I can hardly believe that e.g. III. xviii. 29-30, transposed with Phillimore after II. vi. 16 by Goold, would have been deleted there and not in their transmitted position, when the couplet is so obviously senseless where we read it.

Yet the real test is whether the transpositions adopted by Goold are convincing in themselves. If they are, one may think further about Goold's or other explanations of the process. So let us review the few transpositions over long distances which Goold admits to his text. These are: II. ii. 9-12 after II. xxix. 28 (Richardson), II. xxviii. 57f. after III. xviii. 24 (Housman), III. ix. 33f. after II. i. 38 (Housman), III. xviii. 29f. after II. vi. 16 (Phillimore).

---

[192] The couplet was already deleted in Groningen, Rijksuniversitheek 159, written in Rome *c.* 1470 (see Butrica 234f.); according to Hanslik's apparatus it is omitted in Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria 85, dated to the second quarter of the 15th cent. by Butrica (294f.); however, Butrica tells me (*per litteras*) that in his collation of the ms. he did not find any indication that the couplet was omitted. This has always been regarded as the most obvious case of interpolation in Propertius (cf. especially Knoche 1, 11ff.), and one can only agree with Goold's statement (2, 37) that the spuriousness of IV. v. 55-56 can only be contested by the unreasonable.

[193] For the intrusion of parallels or quotations from the margin see most recently Tarrant 134ff.; cf. also K.J. Dover, *The Greeks and their Legacy: Collected Papers* II (Oxford 1988), 201ff.

[194] See Courtney 3, 13ff.

We can divide the four cases into two groups. As regards II. ii. 9-12 and III. xviii. 29f. the problem which seems to recommend the transposition lies with the passage from which the couplet is removed. For II. xxviii. 57f. and III. ix. 33f. one has to argue rather the other way round. The latter is in my view a rather dangerous road from the very start. It is highly dubious whether we should remove a distich like III. ix. 33f., which is inoffensive in its transmitted context,[195] in order to introduce a missing link elsewhere. Surely a lacuna is a much more economical solution.

As regards II. xxviii. 57-58, the couplet does not have much point in its transmitted context, but it is certainly not disruptive; it is not even objectionable.[196] Housman's transposition has obvious merits as regards the place to which II. xxviii. 57-58 are transposed. The transition from III. xviii. 24 to 25 appears to be somewhat abrupt, and a lacuna was suspected by Postgate.[197] However, the transmitted text has been convincingly defended by Shackleton Bailey,[198] and on closer inspection our couplet does not fit as well in its new surroundings as it may seem to at first sight. In their new position II. xxviii. 57f. awkwardly anticipate III. xviii. 27f. When mythical examples in 27f. pass from the beauty of Nireus to the heroic might of Achilles and the riches of Croesus they refer to qualities applicable to Marcellus, and in fact all but one correspond to the famous Vergilian counterpart.[199] The same is true for Marcellus' qualities praised in 11-16 (*genus* and *uirtus*), but this list does not overlap with 27f. This deliberate economy would be disturbed if the topic of beauty in 27 were anticipated before 25.

II. ii. 11-12 present a real textual problem, and already Carutti and Tremenheere have seen that emendation of the corrupt begin-

---

195 To be sure, the transition from 34 to 35 is abrupt in III. ix, but surely the problem does not lie with 33-34 (32-35 are no better). For Heyworth's transposition of 21f. see below p. 73f.

196 Butler-Barber may seem too kind when they remark: "A well-expressed general reflection, in no way out of harmony with the context". Camps explains well: "The thought of the human beauties whom death has taken passes into a general reflection on the brief duration of beauty or riches and the inevitability of death for all humans." See also Giardina *ad loc.*, who rightly rejects Enk's explanation. Knoche (3, 57-9 = 322-4) deletes the distich (after Fontein). Interpolations of this type are well attested; yet his objections to the language fail to carry conviction.

197 Regarded with sympathy by Butler-Barber.

198 Shackleton Bailey 2, 200. Fedeli (*ad loc.*) favours a different explanation of *ille* (25), which he defends with inappropriate parallels.

199 Cf. *egregium forma iuuenem* (Verg. *Ae.* vi. 861); for his *bellica uirtus* cf. 872ff., 879ff. *pietas*, another quality praised by Vergil (v. 878), is referred to explicitly in 31f.

ning of 11 does not solve the overriding problem. As it stands, the mythical example evoked in 11-12 does not suit its context at all (9-10, however, do). I have briefly mentioned the problem above[200] and suggested a lacuna. This is not only an easier solution than transposition: it is supported by the general state of the text in book II as outlined above,[201] and the relative shortness of II. ii adds further support to the hypothesis of a lacuna.

The severest problem among all the passages in question is posed by III. xviii. 29-30. This couplet is without doubt utterly intolerable in its transmitted position and can hardly find a place in this poem at all. After II. vi. 16 the couplet fits well if *alter amor* in III. xviii. 30 refers to Chryseis. But then the thought would be obscurely expressed. In its new context it is wholly irrelevant that Chryseis was succeeding Clytaemnestra,[202] what matters is that she was Achilleus' girl. *alter amor* in III. xviii. 30 needs a proper context. I see no other solution but to regard III. xviii. 29-30 as a scattered fragment, presumably from a lost poem following or preceding III. xviii.[203]

As regards minor dislocations of single couplets I shall argue below[204] that a considerable number are caused by interpolation. It may be useful to append here, with a brief discussion, a list of the other transpositions which I regard as certain. Of course, there are many others which are possible or even plausible, but we should bear in mind that too large a number of dislocations caused by oversight may seem *a priori* improbable.

In book I I would accept two transpositions. Goold justly revives Carutti's almost forgotten transposition of viii. 13-14 after 18. The distich is extremely awkward in its transmitted place; if it is placed before v. 19 it offers a striking explanation for the corrupt text in the latter.[205] In addition I suggest transposing v. 1f. after iv. 4. That these lines belong together with the preceding elegy was already seen by Enk[206] who wanted to divide the poems after v. 2 instead of iv. 28. Enk later[207] retracted his opinion, but his arguments were taken up convincingly by Heyworth in his unpublished dissertation. However, I doubt that the lines make a good concluding couplet. The impatient

---

200 P. 17.
201 Pp. 1ff.
202 Even less intelligible would be a reference to Argynnus.
203 See also below p. 147ff.
204 See p. 115ff.
205 See Goold 3, 106f.; cf. also id., 'Adversaria Maniliana', *Phoenix* 13 (1959), 100.
206 *Ad Propertii carmina commentarius criticus* (Leipzig 1911), 20.
207 Cf. his commentary on book I *ad loc.*

tandem does not fit the end of poem.[208] If the distich is put after 4 the poem falls into five equal blocks of six lines each.[209]

In book II, not surprisingly, the order is disturbed more frequently: iv. 9-10 have to be exchanged with 15-16 (Postgate), viii. 25-26 belong after 20 (Richmond), xiv. 13-14 after 10 (Fontein), xxiv. 47-48 after 22 (Rossberg). The two necessary changes in xvi. have been discussed above *in extenso*. This makes six cases in all.

None of the transpositions listed here has found universal acceptance; all but one (viii. 25-26 after 20) have at least been printed by Goold. The need to transpose iv. 15-16 has been recognised by the vast majority of editors. The hesitation to draw the conclusion may well be due to the fact that neither Otto's transposition after 4 nor Baehrens's after 8 is fully convincing. Goold justly saved Postgate's striking solution from oblivion. The text restored speaks for itself. 15-16 were certainly likely to fall out after 8,[210] but we need only remember that the poem is affected anyway by a major text loss at the beginning,[211] and one will suspect that the omission of both 9-10 and 15-16 may go back to physical damage to the ms. Why the two couplets were inserted where we read them should be obvious to everyone.

Richmond's transposition of viii. 25-26 after 20 is another case of a totally ignored proposal which seems evidently correct to me. No modern commentator has bothered to explain the connection between 21ff. and what precedes or the transition from 24 to 25. In both cases I fail to see any connection at all. Richmond's transposition achieves a neat and clear train of thought. The omission of 25-26 after 20 may be explained by the similarity between *sed non* (25) and *quid non* (21).

The exchange between xiv. 13-14 and 11-12 produces an absolutely convincing text, and the dislocation is explained so easily that one will be reluctant to renounce Fontein's transposition. 11-12 were lost because of the resemblance *at dum* (11)—*atque utinam* (15).[212]

I find it very hard to escape the conclusion that xxiv. 49ff. belong directly after the mythical examples of manly infidelity. 47-48 are ludicrous after 43-46. Their omission after 22, where they belong,

---

[208] *tandem* is never found in a concluding couplet in Propertius; twice however it stands in an opening line (I. v. 1, II. xxviii. 1).

[209] See below p. 139.

[210] The similarity of the endings of 8 and 16 (*manus*/ *anus*) has long been noted.

[211] See above p. 7f.

[212] In minuscule script there is even a certain similarity between *lacu* (12) and *datur* (16).

was caused by the similarity between *-s uni si qua parare po-* (48) and *-s una discat amare do-* (24).[213]

In book III five transpositions of single couplets seem necessary to me: viii. 3f. after 8 (Heyworth), ix. 21-22 after 34 and 57f. after 46 (Heyworth) and xx. 19-20 after 14 (Lachmann) and xxii. 15f. after 6 (Housman). In viii. 3ff. the result of Heyworth's transference is to good to renounce this remedy; the dislocation was caused by the similarity *sinu* (8)—*manu* (4).[214] ix. 21-22 will be discussed in detail below[215]; 57f. provide an antecedent for *te duce* (47) which helps the train of thought and identifies Maecenas after *Coe poeta* in 44.[216] The omission of 57 after 46 was due to the *homoiomeson mihi sacra* (46) and *mihi signa* (58). In both the other cases the need for transposition has almost universally been recognised. xiv. 15-16 surely belong after 10 and not after 12 (Canter[217]), not only because of the sequence *nunc...nunc* (9f.) ... *et modo* (15)[218]: 13-14 stand better after 11-12 than after 15-16. In xx the situation is complicated by the question whether the poem is a unity or whether a further transposition (11-12 after 13-14) has to be accepted, which necessitates poem division after 10. Richardson[219] has convincingly argued for unity (with 11-12 in their transmitted place), and I refrain from discussing the question again. In any case, the need to transpose 19-20 is beyond doubt.[220] Editors who leave xxii. 15f. in their transmitted place normally print *et si<s>, qua Ortygie uisenda est, ora Caystri* with Haupt and Keil.[221] *sis* is not palmary, as Fedeli says, but creates a text as awkward and unstylish as possible; I would not have the slightest doubt to reject this text even if it had been transmitted. *si* should certainly not be altered and shows that the couplet belongs after the conditional clause in 5f., where Housman put it.[222] We could only consider to improve on

---

213 For omission caused by *homoiomeson* see Housman in the preface to his Lucan (Oxford ^{2}1927), p. XIX.

214 See Heyworth 3, 204.

215 See p. 73f.

216 Cf. also below p. 74 n. 39.

217 Followed recently by Camps and Hanslik.

218 See Housman 43.

219 P. 398.

220 After 18 the couplet is not "pointless" as Butler-Barber (*ad loc.*) say; it is utter nonsense, and I cannot understand how a commentator as competent as Camps could try to defend the paradosis (against him Fedeli *ad loc.*).

221 *sis* is already found in several humanistic mss.; *Ortygie* for the transmitted *orige* is due to Vat. Barb. VIII 23.

222 His arguments have rightly been taken up by M. E. Hubbard, 'Propertiana', *CQ* 62 (1968), 319; the oversubtle interpretation of the transmitted sequence by U.J.Kocher, *Properz III 22. Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Zürich 1974) is utterly unconvincing.

Housmans transposition by writing with Dr Heyworth: 5, lacuna, 15f., lacuna, 6. As regards emendation of the *vox nihili orige* there is nothing to chose between *olorigeri* and *Ortygie* which forces us to accept an awkward apposition, *ora Caystri*. We may then either write *si qua et olorigeri* with Housman or *si tibi olorigeri* with Phillimore (printed by Goold).

There are many other transpositions with which I feel sympathy: e.g. vi. 3f. may belong after 8 (Housman); Heyworth's[223] transposition of viii. 3f. after 8 is highly likely; xvi. 19-20 after 14 (Struchtmeyer) is obviously attractive. Goold prints both transpositions. Moreover, Dr Heyworth suggests an ingenious solution for the problems in iv. 13-18 where none of the mere transpositions of a single couplet proposed so far convinces: he writes 13, lacuna, 17f., lacuna 14-16.

In book IV a rather large number of plausible transpositions have been suggested and here it is particularly difficult to draw a line between what is certain, likely or merely possible. Before I list the transpositions which I think should be adopted in the text, I wish to mention that in two elegies where much disorder has been suspected by many (iv and xi) I am convinced that only very few transpositions are persuasive. Most emphatically I would reject any interference with the order of the first twenty lines in iv. The slightly vague, loosely connected train of thought in the first twenty lines adds much to the charm of the poem, which Goold has rightly called one of Propertius' finest compositions.[224] Any alteration of the transmitted order is counterproductive.[225] In xi many transpositions which have been suggested are possible, but I think that the transmitted order is only objectionable in two places.

Seven transposition in book IV seem beyond reasonable doubt to me: i. 83-84 after 76 and 85-86 after 102 (both Richmond), iv. 83-84 after 86 (Barber), v. 29-30 should be exchanged with 45-46 (Goold), ix. 65-66 belong after 42 (Jacob), 71-72 after 74 (Schneidewin), xi. 65f. after 60 (Koppiers) and 69f. after 96 (Postgate).

It is hardly necessary to point out the insurmountable difficulties of the transmitted order in i. 81-86.[226] Richmond's transpositions are among the best ever suggested in Propertius.[227] There is no obvious reason why 83-84 or 85-86 should have been omitted in their rightful

---

223 See Heyworth 3, 204f.

224 Cf. Tränkle's (1, 179) fine interpretation of the beginning of IV. viii; he rightly compares IV. iv.

225 For vv. 83-84 transposed after 86 by Barber see below p. 52.

226 See Butler-Barber *ad loc.*

227 Cf. also Goold 1, 99.

place, though it is quite obvious why, once relegated to the margin, they were inserted where we read them.[228] Tentatively I would suggest that the two couplets were not omitted by oversight but deleted intentionally. This is not a very common process, but I have argued elsewhere[229] that excision of genuine portions of text did happen occasionally. 83-84 may have been felt to be purely ornamental after 76.[230] 85-86 may have seemed difficult to understand (with the corruption *moueant* in 85 they surely are), and someone may have wished to refer *hoc* in 103 to 101-102.

Barber's transposition of iv. 83-84 together with Jacob's *mons erat ascensus, dapibus festoque remissus* in 83 has rightly been adopted by Goold.[231] The interposition of 83f. allows the change of subject between 85f. and 86.

v. 29-30/45-46 are again a case where the result of the transference is too good to be easily rejected. Moreover, there is every reason for omission of the two couplets in their original place. *-ndacia uincant* (27) resembles *-ntica iactat* (45) and *iura pu-* (28) is close to *iunge tu-* (46). The reason for the omission of 29-30 was the resemblance *pretiosa* (43)—*pretium* (29). The insertion of 29-30 after 28 was suggested by *mendacia* (27), seemingly fitting with *simulare* (29). Superficially 45-46 may have been felt to be appropriate after 41ff. The redactor has fooled editors for centuries.

For Jacob's transposition of ix. 65-66 see below p. 84 n. 73. Schneidewin's transposition of 71-72 after 74 should need no comment.

Both transpositions in xi commended above have been printed by Goold; that 63f., 67f. and 71f. are closely connected and cannot be interrupted by 65f. and 69f., both completely alien to the context, is fairly clear, and a convincing place for both couplets can be found. It is however wrong to combine these transpositions with Peerlkamp's transference of 97f. after 62 (thus Goold). On the contrary, with 69f. after 96, the couplet 97f. concludes admirably Cornelia's commands to her family.

---

228 As regards the insertion of the two distichs together see above p. 37f.

229 See Günther 2, 24ff., 53.

230 For similar shortenings in the transmission of ancient texts see Günther 2, 35ff., 59ff.

231 Cf. Goold 2, 35.

APPENDIX

The Text of the Poems affected by Maior Dislocation

II. vi A

Non ita complebant Ephyraeae Laidos aedis,
ad cuius iacuit Graecia tota fores;
turba Menandreae fuerat nec Thaidos olim
tanta, in qua populus lusit Ericthonius;
nec quae deletas potuit componere Thebas,
Phryne tam multis facta beata uiris.
<
>[1]

quin etiam falsos fingis tibi saepe propinquos,
oscula ne desint qui tibi iure ferant.
me iuuenum pictae facies, me nomina laedunt,
me tener in cunis et sine uoce puer;
me laedet, si multa tibi dabit oscula mater,
me soror et cum qua dormit amica simul:
omnia me laedent: timidus sum (ignosce timori)
et miser in tunica suspicor esse uirum.

his olim, ut fama est, uitiis ad proelia uentum est,
his Troiana uides funera principiis;
aspera Centauros eadem dementia iussit
frangere in aduersum pocula Pirithoum.
cur exempla petam Graium? tu criminis auctor,
nutritus duro, Romule, lacte lupae:
tu rapere intactas docuisti impune Sabinas:
per te nunc Romae quidlibet audet Amor.

felix Admeti coniunx et lectus Ulixis,
et quaecumque uiri femina limen amat!
templa Pudicitiae quid opus statuisse puellis,
si cuiuis nuptae quidlibet esse licet?

---

[1] See above p. 25f.

sed non immerito! uelauit aranea fanum
et mala desertos occupat herba deos.
quos igitur tibi custodes, quae limina ponam,
quae numquam supra pes inimicus eat?
nam nihil inuitae tristis custodia prodest:
quam peccare pudet, Cynthia, tuta sat est.
[nos uxor numquam, numquam seducet amica:
semper amica mihi, semper et uxor eris.][2]

II. vi B

....

quae manus obscenas depinxit prima tabellas
et posuit casta turpia uisa domo,
illa puellarum ingenuos corrupit ocellos
nequitiaeque suae noluit esse rudis.
a gemat, in tenebris ista qui protulit arte
orgia sub tacita condita laetitia!
non istis olim uariabant tecta figuris:
tum paries nullo crimine pictus erat.

....

II. xvi A

Praetor ab Illyricis uenit modo, Cynthia, terris,
maxima praeda tibi, maxima cura mihi.
non potuit saxo uitam posuisse Cerauno?
a, Neptune, tibi qualia dona darem!
nunc sine me plena fiunt conuiuia mensa,
nunc sine me tota ianua nocte patet.
quare, si sapis, oblatas ne desere messis
et stolidum pleno uellere carpe pecus;
deinde, ubi consumpto restabit munere pauper,
dic alias iterum nauiget Illyrias!
Cynthia non sequitur fascis nec curat honores,
semper amatorum ponderat una sinus.
semper in Oceanum me mittit[3] quaerere gemmas,
et iubet ex ipsa tollere dona Tyro.

---

[2] See below p. 120.
[3] See below p. 93.

ergo muneribus quiuis mercatur amorem? 15
  Iuppiter, indigna merce puella perit. 16
atque utinam Romae nemo esset diues, et ipse 19
  straminea posset dux habitare casa! 20
numquam uenales essent ad munus amicae,
  atque una fieret cana puella domo;
numquam septenas noctes seiuncta cubares,
  candida tam foedo bracchia fusa uiro;
non quia peccarim (testor te), sed quia uulgo 25
  formosis leuitas semper amica fuit. 26
at tu nunc nostro, Venus, o succurre dolori, 13
  rumpat ut assiduis membra libidinibus! 14
barbarus excussis[4] agitat uestigia lumbis- 27
  et subito felix nunc mea regna tenet!

aspice quid donis Eriphyla inuenit amaris,
  arserit et quantis nupta Creusa malis. 30
sed quascumque tibi uestis, quoscumque smaragdos, 43
  quasue dedit flauo lumine chrysolithos,
haec uideam rapidas in uanum ferre procellas: 45
  quae tibi terra, uelim, quae tibi fiat aqua.
non semper placidus periuros ridet amantis
  Iuppiter et surda neglegit aure preces.
uidisti toto sonitus percurrere caelo,
  fulminaque aetheria desiluisse domo: 50
non haec Pleiades faciunt neque aquosus Orion,
  nec sic de nihilo fulminis ira cadit;
periuras tunc ille solet punire puellas,
  deceptus quoniam fleuit et ipse deus.

quare ne tibi sit tanti Sidonia uestis, 55
  ut timeas, quotiens nubilus Auster erit.

II.xvi B

(?) ....
nullane sedabit nostros iniuria fletus? 31
  an dolor hic uitiis nescit abesse tuis?
tot iam abiere dies, cum me nec cura theatri

---

[4] See above p. 37.

nec tetigit Campi, nec mea mensa iuuat.
at pudeat, certe pudeat, nisi forte, quod aiunt,
turpis amor surdis auribus esse solet.
cerne ducem, modo qui fremitu compleuit inani
Actia damnatis aequora militibus:
hunc infamis amor uersis dare terga carinis
iussit et extremo quaerere in orbe fugam.
Caesaris haec uirtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:
illa, qua uicit, condidit arma manu.
(?) ....

II. xvii

Mentiri noctem, promissis ducere amantem,
hoc erit infectas sanguine habere manus! 2
[nunc iacere e duro corpus iuuat, impia, saxo, 13
sumere et in nostras trita uenena manus.][5] 14
horum ego sum uates, quotiens desertus amaras
expleui noctes fractus utroque toro. 4
aut si es dura, nega: sin es non dura, uenito! xxii B. 43
quid iuuat heu[6] nullo pondere uerba loqui?
hic unus dolor est ex omnibus acer amanti, 45
speranti subito si qua uenire negat.
quanta illum toto uersant suspiria lecto,
cum recipi, quae non uenerit, ipse uetat!
et rursus puerum quaerendo audita fatigat,
[quem, quae scire timet, quaerere fata iubet.] 50
<......................................>

uel tu Tantalea moueare ad flumina sorte, xvii. 5
ut liquor arenti fallat ab ore sitim;
uel tu Sisyphios licet admirere labores,
difficile ut toto monte uolutet onus;
durius in terris nihil est quod uiuat amante,
nec, modo si sapias, quod minus esse uelis. 10
quem modo felicem inuidia admirante ferebant,
nunc decimo admittor uix ego quoque die,
nec licet in triuiis sicca requiescere luna, 15
aut per rimosas mittere uerba fores.

---

[5] See below p. 127.
[6] See above p. 8 n. 21 and below p. 113 n. 221.

quod quamuis ita sit, dominam mutare cauebo:
tum flebit, cum in me senserit esse fidem.

II. xxviii A

Iuppiter, affectae tandem miserere puellae: 1
tam formosa tuum mortua crimen erit. 2
hoc tibi uel poterit coniunx ignoscere Iuno: 33
frangitur et Iuno, si qua puella perit.
deficiunt magico torti sub carmine rhombi, 35
et iacet exstincto laurus adusta foco;
et iam Luna negat totiens descendere caelo,
nigraque funestum concinit omen auis.

una ratis fati nostros portabit amores
caerula in inferno uelificata lacu[7]. 40
si non unius, quaeso, miserere duorum!
uiuam, si uiuet; si cadet illa, cadam.
pro quibus optatis sacro me carmine damno:
scribam ego 'Per magnum est salua puella Iouem';
ante tuosque pedes illa ipsa operata sedebit, 45
narrabitque sedens longa pericla sua.

uenit enim tempus, quo torridus aestuat aer, 3
incipit et sicco feruere terra Cane.
sed non tam ardoris culpa est neque crimina caeli, 5
quam totiens sanctos non habuisse deos.
hoc perdit miseras, hoc perdidit ante puellas:
quidquid iurarunt, uentus et unda rapit.
num sibi collatam doluit Venus? illa peraeque
prae se formosis inuidiosa dea est. 10
an contempta tibi Iunonis templa Pelasgae?
Palladis aut oculos ausa negare bonos?
semper, formosae, non nostis parcere uerbis.
hoc tibi lingua nocens, hoc tibi forma dedit.

sed tibi uexatae post multa pericula uitae 15
extremo ueniet mollior hora die.
Io uersa caput primos mugiuerat annos:

---

7 See below p. 102.

nunc dea, quae Nili flumina uacca bibit.
Ino enim prima terris aetate uagata est:
hanc miser implorat nauita Leucothoen.
[Andromede monstris fuerat deuota marinis:
haec eadem Persei nobilis uxor erat.][8]
Callisto Arcadios errauerat ursa per agros:
haec nocturna suo sidere uela regit.

quod si forte tibi properarint fata quietem,
illa sepulturae fata beata tuae.
narrabis Semelae, quo sis formosa periclo,
credet et illa, suo docta puella malo;
et tibi Maeonias omnis heroidas inter
primus erit nulla non tribuente locus.
nunc, utcumque potes, fato gere saucia morem:
et deus et durus uertitur ipse dies.

II. xxx A

....

< >[9] Phrygias nunc ire per undas 19
et petere Hyrcani litora rauca maris,
spargere et alterna communis caede Penatis
et ferre ad patrios praemia dira Lares! 22

....

quo fugis a demens? nulla est fuga: tu licet usque 1
ad Tanain fugias, usque sequetur Amor.
non si Pegaseo uecteris in aere dorso,
nec tibi si Persei mouerit ala pedes;
uel si te sectae rapiant talaribus aurae,
nil tibi Mercurii proderit alta uia.
instat semper Amor supra caput, instat amanti,
et grauis ipsa super libera colla sedet.
excubat ille acer custos et tollere numquam
te patietur humo lumina capta semel.

....

et iam si pecces, deus exorabilis ille est, 11
si modo praesentis uiderit esse preces

....

[8] See p. 124 n. 274.
[9] See below p. 87f.

II. xxxii
(to be connected with xxxi)

hoc utinam spatiere loco, quodcumque uacabis, 7
Cynthia, sed tibi me credere turba uetat,
cum uidet accensis deuotam currere taedis
in nemus et Triuiae lumina ferre deae. 10
qui uidet, is peccat: qui te non uiderit ergo, 1
non cupiet: facti lumina crimen habent.
nam quid Praenesti dubias, o Cynthia, sortis,
quid petis Aeaei moenia Telegoni?
cur ita te Herculeum deportant esseda Tibur? 5
Appia cur totiens te uia Lanuuium?

scilicet umbrosis sordet Pompeia columnis
porticus, aulaeis nobilis Attalicis,
et platanis creber pariter surgentibus ordo,
flumina sopito quaeque Marone cadunt,
et sonitus lymphis tota crepitantibus orbe 15
cum subito Triton ore refundit aquam. 16

falleris, ista tui furtum uia monstrat amoris: 17
non urbem, demens, lumina nostra fugis!
nil agis, insidias in me componis inanis,
tendis iners docto retia nota mihi. 20
sed de me minus est: famae iactura pudicae
tanta tibi miserae, quanta meretur, erit.
nuper enim de te nostras †me laedit†[10] ad auris
rumor, et in tota non bonus urbe fuit.'

'sed tu non debes inimicae credere linguae: 25
semper formosis fabula poena fuit.
non mea deprenso damnata est fama ueneno:
testis eris puras, Phoebe, uidere manus.
sin autem longo nox una aut altera lusu
consumpta est, non me crimina parua mouent. 30

<

>

an quisquam in tanto stuprorum examine quaerit 41

[10] See below p. 112.

"Cur haec tam dives? quis dedit? unde dedit?"
o nimium nostro felicem tempore Romam,
si contra mores una puella facit!
haec eadem ante illam iam impune et Lesbia fecit:
quae sequitur, certe est inuidiosa minus.
qui quaerit Tatium ueterem durosque Sabinos,
hic posuit nostra nuper in urbe pedem.

tu prius et fluctus poteris siccare marinos,
altaque mortali deligere astra manu,
quam facere, ut nostrae nolint peccare puellae;
hic mos Saturno regna tenente fuit;
at cum Deucalionis aquae fluxere per orbem,
et post antiquas Deucalionis aquas,
dic mihi, quis potuit lectum seruare pudicum,
quae dea cum solo uiuere sola deo?

uxorem quondam magni Minois, ut aiunt,
corrupit torui candida forma bouis;
nec minus aerato Danae circumdata muro
non potuit magno casta negare Ioui.
Tyndaris externo patriam mutauit amore,
et sine decreto uiua reducta domum est.

ipsa Venus, quamuis corrupta libidine Martis,
nec minus in caelo semper honesta fuit,
quamuis Ida †Parim† pastorem dicat amasse
atque inter pecudes accubuisse deam;
hoc et Hamadryadum spectauit turba sororum
Silenique senes et pater ipse chori;
cum quibus Idaeo legisti poma sub antro,
supposita excipiens, Nai, caduca manu.
<
>

....
'quod si tu Graias, si tu es imitata Latinas,
semper uiue meo libera iudicio!'

III. vii

Ergo sollicitae tu causa, pecunia, uitae!
per te immaturum mortis adimus iter;
tu uitiis hominum crudelia pabula praebes;
semina curarum de capite orta tuo.
tu Paetum ad Pharios tendentem lintea portus 5
obruis insano terque quaterque mari.
nam dum te sequitur, primo miser excidit aeuo
et noua longinquis piscibus esca natat. 8

Paete, quid aetatem numeras? quid cara natanti 17
mater in ore tibi est? non habet unda deos.
nam tibi nocturnis ad saxa ligata procellis
omnia detrito uincula fune cadunt. 20
et mater non iusta piae dare debita terrae 9
nec pote cognatos inter humare rogos, 10
sed tua nunc uolucres astant super ossa marinae,
nunc tibi pro tumulo Carpathium omne mare est.

infelix Aquilo, raptae timor Orithyiae,
quae spolia ex illo tanta fuere tibi?
aut quidnam fracta gaudes, Neptune, carina? 15
portabat sanctos alueus ille uiros. 16
reddite corpus humo, posita est in gurgite uita; 25
Paetum sponte tua, uilis harena, tegas;
et quotiens Paeti transibit nauta sepulcrum,
dicat 'Et audaci tu timor esse potes.'

ite, rates curuate et leti texite causas:
ista per humanas mors uenit acta manus. 30
terra parum fuerat, fatis adiecimus undas:
fortunae miseras auximus arte uias.
ancora te teneat, quem non tenuere penates?
quid meritum dicas, cui sua terra parum est?
uentorum est, quodcumque paras: haud ulla carina 35
consenuit, fallit portus et ipse fidem. 36

sunt Agamemnonias testantia litora curas, 21
quae notat Argynni poena Athamantiadae.
hoc iuuene amisso classem non soluit Atrides,
pro qua mactata est Iphigenia mora. 24
saxa triumphalis fregere Capharea puppis,

naufraga cum uasto Graecia tracta salo est. 40
paulatim socium iacturam fleuit Vlixes,
in mare cui soliti non ualuere doli. 42
natura insidians pontum substravit auaris: 37
ut tibi succedat, uix semel esse potest. 38

nunc tulit haec Paetus, stridorem audire procellae 47
et duro teneras laedere fune manus;
sed thyio thalamo aut Oricia terebintho
effultum pluma uersicolore caput. 50
huic fluctus uiuo radicitus abstulit unguis,
et miser inuisam traxit hiatus aquam;
hunc paruo ferri uidit nox improba ligno:
Paetus ut occideret, tot coiere mala.
flens tamen extremis dedit haec mandata querelis, 55
cum moribunda niger clauderet ora liquor:

'Di maris Aegei quos sunt penes aequora, uenti,
et quaecumque meum degrauat unda caput,
quo rapitis miseros primae lanuginis annos?
attulimus longas in freta uestra comas. 60
a miser alcyonum scopulis affligar acutis!
in me caeruleo fuscina sumpta deo est.
at saltem Italiae regionibus euehat aestus:
hoc de me sat erit si modo matris erit.'
subtrahit haec fantem torta uertigine fluctus; 65
ultima quae Paeto uoxque diesque fuit.

quod si contentus patrio boue uerteret agros, 43
uerbaque duxisset pondus habere mea,
uiueret ante suos dulcis conuiua Penatis, 45
pauper, at in terris nil nisi fleret opes.
o centum aequoreae Nereo genitore puellae, 67
et tu materno tacta dolore Theti;
uos decuit lasso supponere bracchia mento:
non poterat uestras ille grauare manus. 70
at tu, saeue Aquilo, numquam mea uela uidebis:
ante fores dominae condar oportet iners.

III. viii

Dulcis ad hesternas fuerat mihi rixa lucernas,
uocis et insanae tot maledicta tuae. 2
tu uero nostras audax inuade capillos 5
et mea formosis unguibus ora nota,
tu minitare oculos subiecta exurere flamma,
fac mea rescisso pectora nuda sinu!
cum furibunda mero mensam propellis et in me 3
proicis insana cymbia plena manu,
nimirum ueri dantur mihi signa caloris: 9
nam sine amore graui femina nulla dolet. 10

quae mulier rabida iactat conuicia lingua,
haec Veneris magnae uoluitur ante pedes.
custodum grege seu circa se stipat euntem,
seu sequitur medias, Maenas ut icta, uias,
seu timidam crebro dementia somnia terrent, 15
seu miseram in tabula picta puella mouet,
his ego tormentis animi sum uerus haruspex,
has didici certo saepe in amore notas.
non est certa fides, quam non in iurgia uertas:
hostibus eueniat lenta puella meis. 20

in morso aequales uideant mea uulnera collo:
me doceat liuor mecum habuisse meam.
aut in amore dolere uolo aut audire dolentem,
siue meas lacrimas siue uidere tuas. 24
odi ego quae numquam pungunt suspiria somnos: 27
semper in irata pallidus esse uelim.
dulcior ignis erat Paridi, cum Graia per arma
Tyndaridi poterat gaudia ferre suae: 30
dum uincunt Danai, dum restat barbarus Hector,
ille Helenae in gremio maxima bella gerit.

aut tecum aut pro te mihi cum riualibus arma
semper erunt: in te pax mihi nulla placet. 34

viii B

....

tecta superciliis si quando uerba remittis, 25
aut tua cum digitis scripta silenda notas. 26

....

gaude, quod nulla est aeque formosa: doleres,
si qua foret: nunc sis iure superba licet.
at tibi, qui nostro nexisti retia lecto,
sit socer aeternum nec sine matre domus!
cui nunc si qua data est furandae copia noctis,
offensa illa mihi, non tibi amica, dedit.

IV. ii

Qui mirare meas tot in uno corpore formas,
accipe Vertumni †signa paterna dei†[11].
Tuscus ego et Tuscis orior, nec paenitet inter
Proelis Volsinios deseruisse focos, 4
tempore quo sociis uenit Lycomedius armis 51
quoque[12] Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.
uidi ego labentis acies et tela caduca,
atque hostes turpi terga dedise fugae. 54
et tu, Roma, meis tribuisti praemia Tuscis, 49
unde hodie Vicus nomina Tuscus habet. 50
sed facies, diuum Sator, ut Romana per aeuum 55
transeat ante meos turba togata pedes[13]. 56
haec me turba iuuat, nec templo laetor eburno: 5
Romanum satis est posse uidere Forum.

hac quondam Tiberinus iter faciebat, et aiunt
remorum auditos per uada pulsa sonos:
at postquam ille suis tantum concessit alumnis,
Vertamnus uerso dicor ab amne deus. 10
seu, quia uertentis fructum praecerpsimus anni,
Vertanni rursus creditur esse sacrum. 12
mendax fama, uaces: alius mihi nominis index: 19
de se narranti tu modo crede deo. 20

opportuna mea est cunctis natura figuris:
in quamcumque uoles uerte, decorus ero.
indue me Cois, fiam non dura puella:
meque uirum sumpta quis neget esse toga?
da falcem et torto frontem mihi comprime faeno: 25

[11] See below p. 93 n. 105.
[12] See below p. 106.
[13] 49-56 post 4 et 49-50 post 54 Housman.

iurabis nostra gramina secta manu.
arma tuli quondam et, memini, laudabar in illis:
corbis in imposito pondere messor eram.
sobrius ad lites: at cum est imposta corona,
clamabis capiti uina subisse meo. 30
cinge caput mitra, speciem furabor Iacchi;
furabor Phoebi, si modo plectra dabis. 32
[est etiam aurigae species Vertumnus et eius 35
traicit alterno qui leue corpus equo.][14] 36
cassibus impositis uenor: sed harundine sumpta 33
fautor plumoso sum deus aucupio. 34
sub petaso[15] pisces calamo praedabor, et ibo 37
mundus demissis institor in tunicis.
pastor me ad baculum possum curuare uel idem
sirpiculis medio puluere ferre rosam. 40

nam quis ego adiciam, de quo mihi maxima fama est,
hortorum in manibus dona probata meis? 42
prima mihi uariat liuentibus uua racemis, 13
et coma lactenti spicea fruge tumet;
hic dulcis cerasos, hic autumnalia pruna 15
cernis et aestiuo mora rubere die;
insitor hic soluit pomosa uota corona,
cum pirus inuito stipite mala tulit[16]. 18
caeruleus cucumis tumidoque cucurbita uentre 43
me notat et iunco brassica uincta leui;
nec flos ullus hiat pratis, quin ille decenter 45
impositus fronti langueat ante meae.
at mihi, quod formas unus uertebar in omnis,
nomen ab euentu patria lingua dedit. 48

sex superant uersus: te, qui ad uadimonia curris, 57
non moror: haec spatiis ultima creta meis.
stipes acernus eram, properanti falce dolatus,
ante Numam grata pauper in urbe deus. 60
at tibi, Mamurri, formae caelator aenae,
tellus artificis ne terat Osca manus,
qui me tot docilem potuisti fundere in usus.
unum opus est, operi non datur unus honos.

---

14 See below p. 124f. (35-36 post 32 Goold; del. Fontein).

15 See below p. 124 n. 276.

16 13-18 post 42 Heyworth.

CHAPTER TWO

INTERPOLATION

2.1 *Interpolation in Lacunae*

2.1.1 *Documented Interpolation in Lacunae*

The view which sees interpolation as the primary reason for the deplorable condition of the text of Propertius is certainly the second most discredited theory after that of verse transposition, and the distinguished scholars like Jachmann and Knoche who advocated it have hardly been treated with more respect than Richmond in recent studies.[1] Yet even in Latin criticism the hyper conservatism of the last few decades appears to be coming to an end, and when it once seemed that Latinists took slightly more time to respond to the change of mood among classical scholars than their Hellenist colleagues, they are now in the forefront of 'Interpolationsforschung' with such impressive studies as e.g. Zwierlein's recent volumes on Plautus.[2] I have already had the opportunity elsewhere[3] to draw attention to the ample confirmation which the general outlines of Jachmann's work on interpolation have received from recent papyrological studies, and it may seem time for a reappraisal of Jachmann's work on Latin texts as well.[4] But more, of course, than the changing trends of fashion was responsible for the discredit in which Jachmann's and Knoche's work on interpolation in Propertius has fallen, and indeed distinguished scholars have been downright dismissive of Jachmann's views.[5]

There can be no doubt that both Jachmann and Knoche were grossly overconfident in having found *the* master key to solve most, if not all the major textual problems in Propertius, and Jachmann in particular certainly went too far on occasions in assuming wholesale

---

[1] Cf. e.g. Eisenhut in his introduction to the *WdF*—volume on Propertius (Darmstadt 1975), VIIIf.

[2] *Zur Kritik und Exegese des Plautus I-, Abh. Ak. Mainz* 1990-. Cf. also Tarrant 121ff.

[3] Cf. Günther 2, 93ff.

[4] One may note with satisfaction that Jachmann's 'Studien zu Juvenal', *NGG* (1943), 187-266, which are not even mentioned in the modern English standard commentary on this author, are now cited among the prime examples of German 'Interpolationsforschung' by Tarrant (123 n. 5). Cf. also M. D. Reeve, rev. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*, *CPh* 80 (1985), 91.

[5] Cf. Shackleton Bailey 1, 13ff.

imports by interpolation. Again, as in the case of verse transposition there is a need for a measured approach. It would be foolish to deny that interpolation could be a cause of problems in a text as badly transmitted as that of Propertius, if one does not rule out the phenomenon generally in a pure 'Lesetext'.[6] If, however, we accept interpolation in such authors as e.g. Ovid, Seneca, Lucan or Valerius Flaccus, where there is documentary evidence for the process,[7] we can hardly refrain from putting the question of interpolation to the test in Propertius[8].

Indeed, the text of Propertius too appears to supply some documentary evidence for interpolation, but it seems that this evidence has perhaps been discussed so intensely that it has become difficult to see the light through the smoke screen. The famous lacunae in the *Neapolitanus* have been the object of fierce controversy since the days when N was thought to be the only source of the text, and the problem of the origin of the supplements of the A-class is still discussed in the most recent study of Propertian mss. by Butrica in the light of his new discoveries.[9] Odd as it may seem to add a further item to a long bibliography, it is of crucial interest for our problem, indeed for Propertian criticism in general, to have a fresh look at the lacunae in N without methodological prejudice and not primarily from a point of view mainly concerned with the relations among our mss. So let us take every single case of a supplement of N's lacunae in the other mss. on its own merits as a case for interpolation or preservation of genuine tradition. The implications to be drawn from the presence of the full text in both Π and Λ will be discussed in due course.

Of course, even if the full text should be regarded as interpolated, the lacunae in N almost exclusively provide evidence for one very special type of interpolation, because all but one of these lacunae

---

[6] On this problem see Tarrant 157ff. and Günther 2, 93ff. with further bibliography.

[7] On Ovid see e.g. Dörrie I 189ff. and U. Fischer, *Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus, Beobachtungen zur Darstellungskunst Ovids in den Heroides unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Briefpaare her. 16 und 17 (Paris und Helena) und her. 20 und 21 (Acontius und Cydippe)* (Diss. Berlin 1969), 132ff., 196ff.; on Seneca see now Zwierlein 12; for surveys of omitted verses in Lucan cf. Housman's (Oxford [2]1927) *praefatio* p. xviiiff. with Fraenkel's review 517ff., G. Bernstein, *Die Versauslassungen in Lucans Bellum civile* (Diss. Jena 1930) and G. Luck, 'Die fehlenden Verse im Lucantext', *RhM* 112 (1969), 254ff., for Valerius Flaccus Ehlers 44ff., 121ff. For further documented examples of interpolation in Latin poets see below p. 118ff.

[8] "Eigentlich ist es also ein rechtes Wunder, dass die Properzkritik bei einer notorisch so unzuverlässigen Textgrundlage heute freiwillig auf dieses Heilmittel fast vollständig verzichtet", Knoche 1, 9.

[9] See p. 83f. The supplements are also in Λ and I shall discuss the question of their presence in Λ further below (p. 88ff.).

concern single lines or half verses only. Thus they hardly ever concern interpolation in the sense of pure additions to the genuine text, rather they would attest attempts to supplement an obviously defective text. It would however be wrong to start the search for documentary evidence for interpolation with the one single case of a complete distich missing from N (III. x. 17-18). Quite apart from the question whether this distich is an interpolation or not,[10] it is certainly wrong to take this case as a starting point if one is to evaluate the external evidence for interpolations in Propertius, because there is an obvious reason for mechanical omission of the distich in N. I therefore propose to go another way and to start from the opposite end of the evidence. The most obvious examples of interpolations in Π and Λ absent from N are found among the missing line ends in the latter, so let us start there. But before we discuss the question of interpolations supplementing a defective text in Propertius, it may be useful to remind ourselves that this type of interpolation is not at all rare elsewhere but well documented.

In particular, interpolation designed to mend a text thought to be syntactically defective, especially lacking a verbal form, is quite common and confirmed by documentary evidence.[11] I shall restrict myself here to citing a few documented examples of cases strictly parallel to the alledged situation in Propertius, namely the interpolation of a metrically defective text.[12] As regards missing line ends, we need not look very far if we think of the examples of ancient supplements of defective lines in Vergil's *Aeneid*, where the *Mediceus* transmits a line filler for xi. 391, the *Romanus* for v. 535 and x. 490, the second hand of the *Palatinus* for vi. 661 and the indirect tradition for ii. 787, viii. 41 and x. 284.[13] Examples of the interpolation of missing pentameters in elegiac poems are attested in Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* (I. ii. 10 is missing in AC, I. viii. 20 in A, IV. iii. 44 in BC), where we also find an interpolated supplement of a genuinely defective hexameter (III. i.

---

10 Deleted by Jachmann and Knoche; see Knoche 1, 50 and below p. 81.

11 It is not necessary to write out examples; for the evidence from Greek tragedy and a bibliography (to which add Stout 117) see Günther 1, 63 n. 34 und Günther 2, 124f..

12 For further examples cf. Knoche 1, 10 n. 1.

13 For viii 40f. (*tumor omnis et irae concessere deum*) a particularly stupid supplement, fabricated on the model of x. 158, is transmitted in Servius (*profugis noua moenia Teucris*). *Audentis Fortuna iuuat* (x 284) is supplemented in Sen. *ep.* 94. 28 by *piger ipse sibi obstat*, a good example of the predilection of interpolators for antithesis. The supplement for ii 787 is in Servius Danielis. On the problem s. J. Sparrow, *Half-lines and Repetitions in Vergil* (Oxford 1931), 46ff. and E. Courtney, 'The Formation of the Text of Vergil', *BICS* 28 (1981), 19; cf. also Donat. *Vita* 41. For supplements of genuinely defective lines in Lucretius see below p. 70.

143 defective in A, supplemented in the rest of the tradition).[14] In Ovid we further meet with documented cases of interpolations designed to mend genuinely defective syntax in *Met.* iv. 446[15] and 767a/768;[16] a similar example is offered by Stat. *Theb.* ix. 760 (om. Pω) and cases in Valerius Flaccus (cf. the additions after iv. 196 and vi. 78 or the supplements for v. 592, omitted in β, and vii. 506f., omitted in Yb) have been discussed by Ehlers.[17] A particularly telling case is also Sen. *HF* 162, interpolated after the omission of 124-161.[18] The closest parallel to the situation in Propertius is offered by the considerable number of missing line ends in Lucretius, some of which are supplemented in one ms. or another[19], and the renaissance interpolations of missing single verses in Tibullus.[20] In Greek poetry two well known examples of medieval supplements for missing line ends occur in Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, vv. 109 εἰς τήνδε δέλτον, ἣν κατ' εὐφρόνης (σκιὰν suppl. P^2) and 1416 λέγω τάδε (οὐδὲν οὐδὲν εὐλαβουμένη suppl. Tr^3).[21] One may also mention the 16th century supplements of defective lines in Callimachus' hymn on Delos.[22]

But let us now come back to Propertius. Five lines lack ends in N: II. xxxiv. 53 and 83, III. i. 27, v. 39 and IV. iii. 7. Among these there is at least one clear case of interpolation:

III. i. 25-8:
nam quis equo pulsas abiegno nosceret arces,
  fluminaque Haemonio comminus isse uiro,
Idaeum Simoenta Iouis cunabula parui,
  Hectora per campos ter maculasse rotas?
27 cunabula parui *om. N*

It has been widely accepted that *cunabula parui* is an impossible supple-

---

[14] Cf. Tarrant 127ff.

[15] The verse is missing in A and added in the margin by a second hand in NWv (by m1 in e); it was rightly deleted by Heinsius, who postulated a lacuna after 445. See also F. Bömer (Heidelberg 1976) *ad loc.* and Luck 1, 60f.

[16] There can hardly be any doubt about the spuriousness of these much discussed lines (see Bömer *ad loc.*), which are absent from A and added only by a later hand in the margin of LNUhv. W.S. Anderson (Leipzig 1977) is surely right to regard them as a supplement for a lacuna; cf. also Luck 1, 61.

[17] P. 122ff.

[18] See Zwierlein 41 and *WJbb* 3(1977), 169 and ibid. 5 (1979), 172. Cf. also the spurious line interpolated in Claud. *DRP* between III. 279 and 280 after the loss of III. 280-360 see Hall, *DRP* 43ff. and on III. 280.

[19] E.g. i. 748, ii. 1115 (in l 31), 752, iii. 538 (in L).

[20] Cf. Luck's (Stuttgart 1988) apparatus on I. ii. 25, x. 26, II. iii. 14 and 75.

[21] On these two verses see G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge 1965), 97f., 102, 187f.

[22] See Pfeiffer in the preface (p. lxxivf.) to his edition. For an example from prose cf. e.g. the supplements of the lacunae of A in the seventh book of Xenophon's Anabasis which Michael Apostoles introduces in his copy Par. 1641 (B).

ment due to confusion of Mount Ida in Troy with that in Crete.[23]

There are two further cases where interpolation is likely; these are

III. v. 39-40:
sub terris sint iura deum et tormenta gigantum,
Tisiphones atro si furit angue caput...
39 gigantum *om. N*

The supplement *gigantum* was rightly condemned by Housman[24] and his verdict has been sustained by Fedeli (*ad loc.*) against recent acceptance of the vulgate.[25]

II. xxxiv. 53-4:
nec si post Stygias aliquid restabit erum(p)nas,
nec si consulto fulmina missa tonent.
53 erum(p)nas *om. N*

aerumnas surely is as plausible a supplement for an interpolator as the resulting text is impossible for Propertius. As in III. v. 39 the text cannot easily be emended on the basis of the *ductus litterarum*.[26]

The other two places are more precarious but the fact that we can discern three cases among five where interpolation is likely or certain must bring the full text in the remaining two under some suspicion.

IV. iii. 7-8
te modo uiderunt iteratos Bactra per ortus,
te modo munito Sericus hostis equo...
Bactra per ortus *om. N*

The supplement *Bactra per ortus* is usually accepted by editors. The awkwardness of the transmitted text, already demonstrated by Housman,[27] has been stressed again more recently by J. D. Morgan.[28] Morgan's modification of Housman's emendation (*Ituraeos*

---

[23] See Fedeli *ad loc.*

[24] "the tales which strike terror into mankind are not so much the punishments of the giants but rather of human malefactors, the bad man fears the doom which has overtaken other bad men", Housman I, 280-1.

[25] Housman suggested *reorum* as a supplement (accepted by Goold; *nocentum* already Lobeck and Haupt).

[26] Goold emphatically supports *restabimus undas*, but cf. Shackleton Bailey 2, 133f. Against his solution see Enk *ad loc.*

[27] See Housman 277.

[28] 'Cruces Propertianae', *CQ* 36 (1986), 189f. Shackleton Bailey's (2, 229f.) defence of *iteratos per ortus* is unconvincing. Nobody would contest that it could mean "the much traversed east", but it would be strange if such an expression were used to denote "long service there by Lycotas" as Shackleton Bailey assumes. Moreover I find *per* quite difficult if *ortus* is to be taken in a local sense, and the whole phrase 'Bactra sees him *iteratos per ortus*' is odd. I rather think the author of this verse intended *iteratos per ortus* to mean 'morning after morning' (considered by Butler-Barber *ad loc.*).

u- B- per arcus Housman; *u- intentos B- per arcus* Morgan) has been accepted in Goold's text. On the one hand *Bactra* is surely a most obvious supplement to make even for an interpolator, but on the other hand there is nothing wrong with it, in fact it seems to be exactly right.[29] The problem is rather *iteratos ... per ortus* and I cannot see a plausible supplement which keeps *iteratos* and discards *Bactra per ortus.*

Similar are the problems in the second case of a supplemented line end in II. xxxiv, v. 83 where the text as it stands is surely corrupt.

nec minor his animis aut sim minor ore canorus
anseris indocto carmine cessit olor.
83 animi *FL* minor ore canorus *om. N*

The transmitted text in 83 is certainly impossible; it yields, however, faultless syntax and even makes some feeble sense in the context, if we accept the reading *si* instead of the dittography *sim* (before *minor*!) from a number of humanistic mss.,[30] and we may ask ourselves again whether this text would not be quite a plausible supplement for an interpolator to make.[31] A convincing emendation of the full text has not been suggested yet; moreover, as Shackleton Bailey has pointed out,[32] this is the only case of an adjective in *-us* at the end of an hexameter in Propertius (there are few nominatives in *-a*, none in *-um*). To regard *minor ore canorus* as an interpolation would rid us of a notorious textual problems in Propertius, and I wonder whether the reluctance so far to contemplate this solution seriously may not partly be due to the disquieting thought that we thus have to resign ourselves to understanding rather little of this famous passage on Vergil and on poetry. Of course, one could ask again for a plausible supplement which ignores Π/Λ.

The last two cases cannot be adduced safely as evidence for interpolated line ends. The first three places surely suggest mechanical damage to the end of lines in the archetype which may on occasion have led to conjectural supplements. The fact of two missing line ends in close vicinity in I. xxxiv makes one suspect that mechanical damage is responsible for N's omission in both cases. In the second place (i.e. II. xxxiv. 83) however N may have omitted barely legible letters

---

[29] Cf. Hor. *C.* III. xxix. 27f. for the juxtaposition of *Sericus* (thus Beroaldus in v. 8 for the *vox nihili hericus*) and *Bactra.*

[30] This would be a minimal correction even if it is a humanist emendation and these mss. do not carry genuine tradition. This text was, in fact, accepted by Hanslik.

[31] For *ore canorus* cf. Aus. *Parent.* xvii 15; Sil. It. viii 247.

[32] See Shackleton Bailey 2, 103.

in the archetype whereas another scribe tried to extract some sense from what he could read. An explanation on these lines appears most plausible to me for the full text in IV. iii. 7.

Let us turn next to the missing single lines in N. These are: II. xxii. 50, III. ix. 35 and xi. 58. Let us begin with III. ix. 33-6:

Caesaris et famae uestigia iuncta tenebis:
    Maecenatis erunt uera tropaea fides.
non ego uelifera tumidum mare findo carina:
    tota sub exiguo flumine nostra mora est.
35 *om. N*

35 not only presents a prosodic licence not elsewhere attested before Ovid;[33] it has rightly been pointed out by Butler-Barber that the verse follows rather abruptly on 34 and we would rather expect a passage of some length between 34 and 36.[34] Taken together with the absence of the verse from N these two objections seem, at first sight, to make it rather likely that III. ix. 35 is an interpolation which does not supplement one verse only but a longer passage.

However, Dr Heyworth suggests to me a solution which would eliminate the problem of abruptness. He proposes to transpose 21f.[35] after 34, and reads *tu cum* for *cum tibi* in 23.[36] I think he is very likely to be right. Not only do 21f. provide exactly the bridge we need between 34 and 35, on closer reflection the couplet is quite out of place where we read it. After the assertion of 20 that everyone follows his own inborn nature[37] the poet's intention to shape his life according to the *praecepta uitae* of somebody else, i.e. Maecenas, must strike one odd. Moreover, what we expect after 17-20 is an emphatic *ego* which suits the pointed opposition (*alii* ... *ego*). This is exactly what we get with Heyworth's text, only that the contrast *alii* ... *ego* is replaced by *alii* ... *tu*.[38] Heyworth intervention in 23 is not only plausible paleographically (*tu* is as likely to fall out before *cum* as *tibi* is likely to

---

33 *Findo* with short -*o*; see Butler-Barber, Camps and Fedeli *ad loc.*; see also below p. 84 n. 78.

34 "..the line (i.e. 35) is omitted by N and, if retained, is extraordinarily abrupt. It may be an interpolation, and it is possible that as many as three lines may have been lost. The sense required is 'Since you are so modest, do not wonder that I have no ambition to turn epic poet'", Butler-Barber *ad loc.* This is, of course, equally true, if 33-34 are removed with Housman and Goold; see above p. 46f.

35 *at tua, Maecenas, uitae praecepta recepi,/ cogor et exemplis te superare tuis.*

36 *cum tibi Romano dominas in honore securis/ et liceat medio ponere iura foro...* (23f.).

37 *naturae sequitur semina quisque suae.*

38 For this cf. the famous lines Verg. *Ae.* vi. 847-853.

be interpolated with *liceat* in 24), with the transmitted text I find the repetition of *tibi* in 25 rather odd.[39]

Should we then, with Heyworth's transposition, accept 35 as genuine? Even the problem with *findo* one may not find insuperable. In fact, Housman has argued decidedly for ascribing the novelty of trochaic scansion to Propertius rather than Ovid.[40] A further argument for the genuineness of the line may be seen in *uelifer* which is attested for the first time here; four other adjectives in *-fer*[41] are found in Propertius for the first time. Still, it makes one think that a line is missing in N directly after a dislocated distich, and that this line in addition should present a prosodic licence not otherwise attested in Propertius.

Curiously enough there is, in close vicinity, a second strikingly parallel case among the three missing single lines in N, III. xi. 58, and perhaps we suspend judgement until we have discussed this case as well. There the problems are again rather complex, and if we want to get the true picture, the problems of the whole passage 57ff. have to be taken into account.

III. xi. 53-72:
bracchia spectaui sacris admorsa colubris,
   et trahere occultum membra soporis iter.
'Non hoc, Roma, fui tanto tibi ciue uerenda!'
   dixit et assiduo lingua sepulta mero.
septem urbs alta iugis, toto quae praesidet orbi,
   femineas timuit territa Marte minas.
Hannibalis spolia et uicti monumenta Syphacis,

---

[39] Heyworth's two transpositions (21f. after 34 and 57f. after 46; see above p. 50) provide substantial aid to a proper understanding of the aims of the poem as whole. Propertius' apparent change of mind from 47 onward, where he in fact announces to treat martial themes, has puzzled commentators and Butler-Barber and others have explained *te duce* in 47 as equivalent to a conditional clause 'only if you yourself change your mood of life'. This interpretation has rightly been rejected by Richardson and Fedeli as putting an unbearable strain on the *abl. abs.* Propertius is not at all in this poem declining courteously a request to write epic poetry, rather he appears to be cautiously preparing the ground for future enterprises. What he is saying is in fact this: "I am surprised, Maecenas, that you among all men should invite me to undertake a task beyond my powers because you have always preferred to resist the temptations of power and remain within the bounds of your station of an *eques*. Having taken to heart the example of your life I feel constrained (*cogor*!; cf. Tränkle 1, 27; the word is essential to the context and should by no means be altered) to do the same and, knowing my limits, I shall therefore be content to write love poetry. However, if *you* lead the way I shall even proceed one time to more demanding themes and my talent will rise to the height of your expectations."

[40] See Housman 276.

[41] *anguifer, gemmifer, odorifer, palmifer* see Tränkle 1, 58.

et Pyrrhi ad nostros gloria fracta pedes?
Curtius expletis statuit monumenta lacunis,
admisso Decius[42] proelia rupit equo,
Coclitis abscissos testatur semita pontis,
est cui cognomen coruus habere dedit:
haec di condiderant, haec di quoque moenia seruant:
uix timeat saluo Caesare Roma Iouem.
nunc ubi Scipiadae classes, ubi signa Camilli,
aut modo Pompeia, Bospore, capta manu?
Leucadius uersas acies memorabit Apollo:
tantum operis belli sustulit una dies.
at tu, siue petes portus seu, nauita, linques,
Caesaris in toto sis memor Ionio.

58 *om. N* timuit *om. Π, habet Λ* [43]

58 is normally printed with Korsch's easy correction of *femineas* to *femineo*,[44] but Shackleton Bailey has rightly pointed out that the text is still unsatisfactory.[45] We can further observe that 59f. cannot follow immediately after 58, and one might perhaps wonder whether the precarious status of 58 and the missing link to what follows are not in some way connected. However, it seems that hitherto due attention has not been paid to the fact that *timuit* is absent from the text of Π.[46] It must be highly perplexing that v. 58 appears in fact to be transmitted in a metrically defective form in Π. Whether *timuit* in Λ is a piece of genuine tradition or a humanist conjecture can perhaps not be decided with absolute certainty, even more so because judgement about *timuit* will necessarily depend on that about the spuriousness of the line and *vice versa.*

On the other hand, as Shackleton Bailey has seen, the combination *timuit territa* is displeasing and it must cause some surprise that casual omission in Π should have affected a line missing in N. In fact one may argue that N may have omitted the line precisely because it

[42] *admisso Decius* is Scaliger's brilliant emendation for at *D- m-*. We surely do not want *at.* For *admisso equo* cf. Cic. *fin.* 2, 61.

[43] The difference of the reports about P in Barber's and Hanslik's apparatuses and Butrica (p. 83) is explained by the fact that *timuit* is in P, but as a later addition.

[44] Supported by Ov. *Met.* xii. 605.

[45] "*minas* needs an epithet as much as *Marte* and the combination *(ex)timuit territa* is unprepossessing. I think more attention should be given to Markland's *edita*, which might have been corrupted for metrical reasons. Richmond expels the line, perhaps rightly in view of its absence from N..." (Shackleton Bailey 1, 175). If the line is retained, Butler-Barber are surely right in preferring to punctuate 57-58 as a question (already suggested by Vahlen), and it is strange that hardly anyone has followed them. For *timuit territa* see below.

[46] This has rightly been pointed out by Courtney 2, 51f.; for his text see below p. 78 n. 60.

was metrically defective.[47] I shall further argue below[48] that the different readings of N and Π for the *locus conclamatus* II. xxx. 19 may represent two different attempts to decipher a badly legible exemplar. Similarly the defective text of Π in III. xi. 58 may be an honest attempt to read a damaged exemplar whereas N chose to omit the illegible line.[49] In fact, we have assumed a similar explanation for the missing line ends in II. xxxiv. 83 and IV. iii. 7 above.[50]

Although it cannot be ruled out that Λ's text is conjectural it seems much more likely that *timuit* is a piece of genuine tradition in Λ. The word is certainly likely to fall out before *territa*, as we shall see below[51] Λ shows hardly any interpolation independent of A(Π) or N.[52] Curiously enough the third case of a missing single line in N (II. xxii. 50) presents again a divergence of readings between Λ and Π and again the reading of Λ is clearly superior and has every chance to be correct.[53] Apart from these two cases Λ shows a fair number of correct readings against both N and A/Π; most of them could be easily conjectural.[54] However, Butrica has convincingly argued in a few cases for the survival of a variant of the archetype in Λ[55]; moreover, Λ appears to exhibit no conjectures beside these correct readings and it must, of course, be held most unlikely that Λ should have made only correct conjectures. The correct readings in Λ appear to be genuine survivals of truth.

But even if we accept Λ's text in III. xi. 58, there is still a formidable obstacle against regarding the line as interpolated. If the verse

---

[47] As an example for this one may cite e.g. Cat. lxiv. 23b.

[48] P. 87f.

[49] Thus Courtney 2, 51.

[50] See p. 71ff.

[51] See p. 90ff.

[52] There is only one probable case of a gloss which crept into the text, see below p. 98ff. on II. iii. 21f.

[53] See below p. 80ff.

[54] Butrica's short list of correct readings in Λ (72) is strangely defective. In Dr Heyworth's collations I find the following true readings of Λ not cited by Butrica (I do not cite a few places where Λ reads a correct conjecture of Coluccio Salutati or P which may have entered Λ by contamination): I. i. 34 defit *ΛN*^{2pc} : desit *NA*, v. 31 quid *ΛN*^{2pc} : quod *NA*, viii. 44 seu *Λ* : siue *NA*, II. xiv. condicio *Λ* : condito *NFP*, xv. 14 menelaeo *Λ* : menelao *NF* : menelaneo *P*, xxvi. 24 que in *L* : que *NF* : quod *LP*, xxxii. 8 tibi me *Λ* : time *N* : timeo *Π*, III. xvi. 13 ambulet *CIL IV 1950*, *ΛP* : -at *NFL*, IV. v. 50 aera *Λ* : acra *NΠ*, viii. 8 ima *Λ* : una *NΠ*. Curiously enough in the distich III. x. 17f. omitted in N, Λ again has a correct reading against Π (polles *Λ* : pelles *Π*). The most indicative case, however, is III. vi. 3 where N and Π present two different corruptions of the correct text of Λ: num *SKJWMUR* : non *N* : dum *ΠTC*.

[55] Cf. I. xviii. 16, II. xxviii. 53, II. xxx. 16; see Butrica 77ff.; on II. iii. 22 see below p. 98f.

were indeed an interpolation, could the interpolator have been stupid enough to mend the lacuna in such a way that the following verse has no syntactical construction? Of course, this question has no point if Passerat was right in transposing 67-68 after 58, and his transposition seems indeed recommended by the fact that 67-68 appear to fit ill in their transmitted place.[56] However, 67-68 sit far from perfectly after 58 either. Accepting *timuit* in 58 one may already object that *nunc* (67) does not suit the preceding perfect very well, but this is only the surface of the problem. With Passerat's transposition of 67-68 the whole sequence of thought from 57 onwards is muddled. The three *exempla* of heroic deeds of the past cited in the distichs 61-64 appear to confirm the view of Rome's invincibility and thus refer to the statement of 65-66, whereas the indignant question 67-68, 59-60 appears to contrast Rome's heroic past with present misery and thus belong together with 57-58. It is extremely odd if these *exempla* are placed in a direct line with the first two, going with 57-58, the rest with what follows in 65-66. There appears something to be said for the transmitted sequence or Richmond's transposition of 59-60 after 68. Thus the *exempla* of 67-68 (and perhaps of 59-60) would be compared to Augustus' even greater achievements. Still, to dismiss Scipio and Aemilius Paullus in the brusque way 67-68 would suggest in their transmitted position would be very odd and, even for Propertius, an extremely tasteless way to exalt the deeds of Augustus. Moreover, 65-66 are very well followed by 69ff., and we do not want the insertion of one let alone two distichs referring to the past.

The transmitted text is decisively improved by Shackleton Bailey's transposition of 65-66 (in addition, of course, to Passerat's transference of 67-68) before 61.[57] However, even this text is not fully satisfactory and certainly not satisfactory enough to justify a double transposition.[58] 65-66 still follow somewhat abruptly on 67-68, 59-60 and Shackleton Bailey's transposition destroys, of course, the close coherence between 65-66 and 69-72.[59] With these difficulties in mind, let us re-examine the text in case we can arrive at a better solution.

---

[56] For Richmond's transposition of 59-60 after 68 (adopted by Butler-Barber, who ascribe it to Passerat) see below.

[57] P. 174ff. I trust the above analysis makes clear why W. R. Nethercut's ('Propertius 3. 11', *TAPA* 102 [1971], 429ff.) objections to Shackleton Bailey's transposition miss the point and his defence of the transmitted order is plainly impossible.

[58] It must however be admitted that Shackleton Bailey's transposition could be justified on the same lines as the double transpositions in II. xvi and III. vii advocated above p. 37f.

[59] There can hardly be any doubt that 69ff. follow better on 65-66 than they do after 64. Nothing recommends Housman's transposition of 65-68 between 58 and 59 (accepted by Goold). The main problem is the transition from 65-66 to 67-68.

As a result of the above considerations one of the main problems of the passage turns out to be the distich 67-68. It does not fit very well where it stands and its transposition after 58 for all its merits as regards the defective syntax of 59-60 creates unacceptable oddities for the sequence of thought. Surely, we do not want a contrast of Rome's glorious past with present decay between 57 and 65ff. This theme has been touched on already in 45-48, and if 67-68 are to be transposed the distich seems to fit better than anywhere else after 46, where Lachmann put it. From 49 onward the poet speaks of Rome's triumph over an unworthy challenge under Augustus' leadership and this is set in due perspective by reference to heroic actions of the past.

The rejection Passerat's transposition of 67-68 seems to speak decisively against regarding 58 as interpolated. A desperate attempt to cut the knot may be to opt after all for a conjunction between 59-60 and 67-68 and to transfer the whole sequence 67-68, 59-60 after 46. But surely nobody will be prepared to go that far. In view of the precarious state of the transmission of 58 one will certainly suspect that a lacuna looms between 57 and 59, a lacuna which may explain the lack of syntactic connection for 59f., a lacuna perhaps of more than one line, and Π/Λ's (?defective) line 58 may be a fragment of the text lost. This may appear to be the easiest solution at first sight, it does however not solve all difficulties of the passage. First of all, even without *timuit* it is difficult to see how 58 fit into an affirmation of the sense required for this place.[60] And, of course, there remains the problem of 67-68. We still have to transpose the lines with Lachmann after 46. Is there another solution?

For all the awkwardness of 67-68 after 58 I think we should seriously consider the possibility that 58 and 67-68 together are interpolated in order to mend a lacuna between 57 and 59. The displacement of 67-68 after 66 may well be connected with the fact that the interpolated verses were absent from part of the transmission. Despite the slight inconsistency of the perfect *timuit* (58) and *nunc* (67) the supplement 58 turns the direction of thought towards a comparison of glorious past and shameful present, a comparison not wanted here, as we have seen, and I think the original text after 57 was quite different, introducing directly the praise of Rome's privileged position in the world. But 67-68 may well have suited the intentions of the interpolator of 58. Moreover, if 59-60 are not to be transposed, the lacuna between 57 and 59 must have been longer than one verse only

---

[60] The solution proposed by Courtney (2, 52), <*auso*> or <*ne auso*> for *timuit* surely does not meet the requirements of the context.

and, even if the interpolator had no external indications to guide him, it would have been quite difficult for him to bridge the gap between 57 and 59 by one verse only. The suspicion that not only 58 but also 67-68 are interpolated is corroborated by the fact that 67-68 are objectionable in themselves. The sudden address *Bospore*, motivated purely by metre, strikes one as rather odd and is hardly justified by other much subtler examples of this device.[61]

If we assume 67-68 to be interpolated together with 58, we must, of course, ask ourselves why only 58 but not 67-68 are absent from N, and how 67-68 alone got into the wrong place in the whole of the tradition. If 58, 67-8 are one single interpolation designed to mend the one lacuna after 57 how did this interpolation come to be split into two parts? A possible answer may be that 58, 67-68 were restored in the margin of a copy where no space was left blank for the missing text between 57 and 59 and thus may have got into the wrong place, i.e. after 66 in a subsequent copy. When it was discovered that 66/ 58 presented the sequence of two pentameters, whereas 57/59 presented that of two hexameters, 58 was transposed to follow 57, but 67-68 was not.[62] Presumably, then, 58 was deleted after 66 and added in the margin beside 57. Thus a subsequent copyist, ignoring marginal variants transcribed 67-68 after 66 but did not insert 58 after 57. One may find this unduly speculative and I certainly would not insist on the probability of the explanation, but this solution is recommended by the fact that it solves all problems of the passage in the most satisfactory way.

Let us now come back to III. ix. 35. Surely, there is one fundamental difference to III. xi. 58. In III. ix the transposed distich, i.e. 21f. is certainly genuine. On the other hand neither must the spuriousness of III. xi. 58 (if it is indeed spurious) argue necessarily for the spuriousness of III. ix. 35. It is perfectly possible that in III. ix the genuine missing verses of a lacuna were recovered and added in the margin exactly as was an interpolation in III. xi; both marginal additions may have suffered the same fate. Nonetheless, I still find it perplexing that a prosodic licence like short *o* in *findo* should only be attested in a line of dubious status, and despite its undoubted quality I cannot bring myself to be confident that it is genuine. The line

---

[61] The two examples cited by Abel 84 are quite different; in both cases (IV. x. 5 and IV. xi. 23) there is some special point in the invocation, emphasis in the first case, *variatio* in the second.

[62] For an example of how a line may become detached from the rest of a later addition one may also point to the ms. F11 of Claudian cited above p. 35.

certainly looks too good for an medieval interpolation and it may well be ancient. On the other hand for this section of the text we rely completely on Π for the reconstruction of A. The line is in Λ, but Λ may have filled a lacuna by contamination from Π.[63] For this case the possibility should be considered seriously that the interpolation may be due to Petrarch, as Professor Reeve has indeed suggested to me.[64] If the connection between dislocation of a distich in the whole tradition and absence of an adjacent single line in N is to be explained on the same lines as for III. xi. 58, we may assume that in III. ix the single line (in this case part of the recovered original) which was relegated to the margin was not taken over into the margin of the archetype of our tradition, and perhaps only Petrarch invented a supplement.

Contamination from Π in Λ is however unlikely for III. xi. 58 and our last case of a single line missing in N, II. xxii. 50. As I have already said above[65], in the latter place Λ again presents a different text from Π and Λ's text is in all probability correct.

II. xxii. 49f.:
et rursus puerum quaerendo audita fatigat,
  quem, quae scire timet, quaerere plura iubet.
plura *Λ* : fata *Π*

The merits of the the text of Λ are obvious. But even with Λ's *plura* the transmission is certainly unacceptable as the work of Propertius, and already humanist scholars had tried their wits at emendation of *quaerere*.[66] However, the line is syntactically complete and even makes some sense in the context; the repetition of *quaerere* from the previous verse would be as much in line with the technique of interpolators as with the habits of careless scribes.[67]

---

63 See above p. 76 n. 54 and below p. 94.

64 Housman 276 has drawn attention to Ov. *ex Pont.* III. ii. 67 and *Her.* xv [xvi]. 31 which he thought to be inspired by our line. These two places may well have inspired Petrarch. Remodelling of the kind in question appears to be in his manner; cf. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford 1976), 6, 15. *freta ... findere* is also found in III. iv. 2 in combination with an adjective in *-fer* (rare in Propertius), *gemmiferi ... maris*.

65 See p. 76.

66 *dicere* for *quaerere* is in the margin (in the hand of ?Marcantonio Morosini) of Vicenza G 2. 8. 12 (written 1460 by Bartolomeo Sanvito; cf. Butrica 319) and in Laur. pl. 38, 37 (*c.* 1460-70; see Butrica 224), Vat. 5174 (written 1464 in Trogir; Butrica 314), Florence, Baldovinetti 213 (?Bologna 1468; Butrica 229), Beroaldus' edition and its copy Burney 242 (see Butrica 245f.).

67 Cf. Dörrie 125, who cites a number of documented examples from Ovid's *Heroides* (pp. 131f., 135f., 142f., 173).

To sum up, as regards single lines missing from N the evidence is rather complicated and precludes certainties. The strongest case for interpolation can be made for III. xi. 58 but the hypothesis advanced above is too complicated to carry absolute conviction. It must however cause perplexity that in all three cases of single lines missing from N, the text as transmitted in Π and Λ presents serious difficulties and even more remarkable is the fact that in all three cases the line absent from N stands either next to a dislocated distich or is itself the concluding line of a dislocated passage. In II. xxii. 50 emendation of the wording is surely possible but does not come cheap. Dubious as the transmitted text is, in all three cases there is nothing which would be unlikely for an interpolator, on the contrary, the author of III. ix. 35 has certainly produced a verse of outstanding quality. I think the case for interpolation is very strong in all three cases.[68]

There remains the one case of omission of a whole distich in N: III. x. 17-18.[69] Heimreich's[70] deletion of the couplet, sustained by Jachmann and Knoche,[71] has been refuted by Shackleton Bailey[72] and since then unanimously rejected by editors. The objections brought against the lines can easily be answered and there is an obvious reason for mechanical omission. This case is also quite different from missing line ends or missing single verses, because it would attest interpolation in the sense of pure addition. Thus the fact that other omissions in N are probably interpolated in the vulgate cannot have any relevance for this case and there seems to be no reason to suspect the lines.

2.1.2 *Two Further Cases of Interpolation in Lacunae*

In addition to the interpolated single lines missing from N I know of two places where a single line present in all manuscripts is probably

---

68 A priori it is of course perfectly plausible that some of the supplements of ΠΛ are genuine and others interpolations. Somebody may have corrected a defective text from another complete copy but added fabrications of his own invention where his source did not offer a supplement (for such a case cf. the additions of the second hand in the ms. Q of Statius' *Thebaid* ; see Klotz in the preface of his Teubner edition p. XIV).

69 *Dein qua primum oculos cepisti veste Properti/ indue, nec vacuum flore relinque caput; / et pete, qua polles, ut sit tibi forma perennis, inque meum semper stent tua regna caput* (15-18).

70 *Quaestiones Propertianae* (1863), 12.

71 Jachmann 2, 342 (= 431); Knoche 1, 50.

72 Shackleton Bailey 2, 166f.. Butrica (194f.) advocates Butler-Barber's transposition, needlessly.

spurious:[73] II. xxvi. 28 and xxxiv. 39.

II. xxvi. 27-30:
multum in amore fides, multum constantia prodest:
  qui dare multa potest, multa et amare potest.
seu mare per longum mea cogitet ire puella,
  hanc sequar et fidos una aget aura duos.

II. xxvi is normally printed as two poems, xxvi A (1-20) and xxvi B (21-58), in modern editions. N begins a new poem with line 29 and recently Goold has followed N's division: he regards 21-28 as the end of a fragment and prints Guyet's *heu* for *seu* in 29. This arrangement dispenses us from assuming a lacuna between before 29, but its most obvious merit is that it removes the offence otherwise caused by 28. If 29ff. form a unity with what precedes, 28 hardly makes sense, even if we emend *multa et amare potest* with Francius to *multum et a- p-* and, with Rothstein, put a question mark at the end of the line. The antithesis of the poor but true with the wealthy but fickle lover is not wanted here, and it would be introduced in not only a rather abrupt but even a very obscure way with line 28. On the other hand, the couplet 27-28 may be appropriate as the conclusion of a poem, and, if 21-28 is a fragment, the relevance of 28 may have been clear from the lost part of the poem.

There are, however, strong objections to Goold's arrangement of the text. First of all, the whole complex xxvi.1-58 forms a unity connected by common imagery and a common atmosphere. The world of sea and shipwreck dominant in 29ff. clearly refers to the dream of 1-20 and binds the whole complex together. In a very interesting paper C. W. Macleod[74] has tried to defend the unity of xxvi A and B.

---

[73] A genuine line is also lost after IV. ix. 41. In its place we read in our mss. a line which recurs below as v. 66. This is, however, not a case of intentional interpolation. There can hardly be any doubt that Jacob's transposition of 65-66 before 43 is correct (see Butler-Barber ad 42), and the double presence of 66 must have a mechanical explanation. I suspect that the original line 42 and 65 were omitted after 41 (perhaps because they were illegible in the exemplar). 65, but not 42 was recovered, and, as 65 is syntactically incomplete, the complete couplet 65-66 was added in the margin, and later inserted after 64 (perhaps it had been added at the bottom of a page which finished with 64). For a similar duplication in the transmission of a prose author cf. the apparatus of Hakanson's edition of the major declamations of Quintilian (Stuttgart 1982) on 159, 28; see also his *praefatio* p. XIX.

[74] 'Propertius 2. 26', *Symbolae Osloenses* 51 (1976), 131-6 = *Collected Essays* (Oxford 1983), 196-201; he also compares III. xx. This is a different case. The poem is a unity. Scaliger's division after 10 has indeed to be rejected, but 12-13 need not refer to the present; they may well refer to the future, depending on what one reads for the transmitted *date* in 13. Goold prints Palmer's *da*.

His reference to I. viii A and B is exactly to the point. xxvi A and B should not be regarded as one poem for the same reasons as I. viii A and B, II. xxviii A and B etc., but 1-20 and 21-58 do indeed form a pair of two closely connected poems.[75] Goold's tripartite arrangement destroys the thematic unity of the whole block. Moreover, 21 is highly appropriate as the beginning of a poem,[76] much more than 29.

As regards the integration of 27-28, the foremost merit of Goold's arrangement, it must be noted that the offence caused by the distich is strictly limited to 28. 27, on the contrary, is perfectly appropriate as an introduction to 29ff.; *fidos* (30) in particular appears to refer back unmistakably to *fides* in 27. The advantages of the division into a pair of two poems (xxvi A and B) are too great to throw them away in order to save 28; and, of course, it does not come free. We have to interfere with the text in two places. In order to end a poem with 28 we have to assume a large lacuna before 21; in order to start a poem with 29 we have to read *heu* there. This double interference is at least uneconomical; to my mind it renders Goold's solution highly dubious.

To be sure, if 21-58 are a unity, the transmitted text cannot stand either. We have to postulate a lacuna before 29, and there still remains our initial question about 28. But perhaps the connection between a lacuna and an inept line provokes a certain suspicion. If we realise that the verse is a very poor fabrication based on Ov. *Am.* III. viii. 62[77] we shall be inclined to accept Broekhuyzen's deletion of the line. Presumably the supplement was designed to fill a lacuna of three verses.

II. xxxiv. 33-46:
nam rursus licet Aetoli referas Acheloi,
  fluxerit ut magno fractus amore liquor,
atque etiam ut Phrygio fallax Maeandria campo
  errat et ipsa suas decipit unda uias,
qualis et Adrasti fuerit uocalis Arion,
  tristis ad Archemori funera uictor equus:
non Amphiareae prosint tibi fata quadrigae
  aut Capanei magno grata ruina Ioui.
desine et Aeschyleo componere uerba coturno,
  desine, et ad mollis membra resolue choros.
incipe iam angusto uersus includere torno,
  inque tuos ignis, dure poeta, ueni.

---

[75] For further reasons for division cf. Shackleton Bailey 1, 18 and 2, 129.
[76] Cf. I. vi, xvii, xix, II. xviii, xxxiii A.
[77] *at nunc, exaequet tetricas licet illa Sabinas,/ imperat ut captae, qui dare multa potest* (61-2).

tu non Antimacho, non tutior ibis Homero:
despicit et magnos recta puella deos.

The only offence in the much emended line 39, considered in isolation, appears to be the faulty metre of the beginning, and I wonder whether we should not rather accept the transmitted text of the line and regard it as spurious than emend. The line is metrically sound if we allow for an incorrect prosody of *Amphiareae*; prosodic errors are typical of interpolators[78] and such an error is particularly understandable in this rare Greek formation.

Yet faulty metre is not the only trouble attached to this line, and mending the metre e.g. by Unger's *num* for *non* (printed by Goold) does not attack the foremost problem. The main reasons for suspecting the text concern the train of thought in 33-46. Butler-Barber (on 33-40) rightly complained about a certain imbalance between 33-38 and 39-40, because only epic poetry on the Theban legend is rejected in 39-40 but there is no mention of the deeds of Hercules referred to in 33-6. Consequently they suggested the loss of a couplet. The objections however to the transmitted text go even further.

As the text stands it would seem that in 39-40 and in a possibly lost distich the singing of the labours of Hercules and of the Theban legends is deemed unsuited for winning the heart of a girl. Yet, in 41-46 the argument is not so much about contents but about form: poetry (on erotic topics) addressed to girls should not have the ring of Aeschylean grandeur or the longwindedness of Homeric or Antimachean poetry but rather conform to the Alexandrian precepts of λεπτότηϲ. Moreover, the incidents in the life of Hercules mentioned in 33-36 appear to be just the erotic ones and, of course, the legend of the Seven had its erotic aspects as well. It is not so much that the topics suggested in 33-38 are rejected as unsuitable for Lynceus' present purposes, but rather that he is invited to treat his subject matter not in the grand epic but in the subtle and sophisticated style of Alexandrian love poetry.

This development of thought is disturbed by the couplet 39-40, where the Theban topic seems to be rejected outright on grounds of contents. Yet it is sufficient to remove the faulty line 39 alone and to regard it as an interpolation in a lacuna. Presumably the text of the genuine line was quite different, and originally 37-40 only expounded the myths of the Seven in four lines balancing the four lines on Heracles. One may object that, with such a reconstruction of 33-40, 41-42 follow somewhat abruptly after 40 and it seems possible that

---

[78] See Jachmann 1, 134f.; Jachmann 2, 343 n. 19.

not only the genuine line 39 but also the couplet following upon 40 has gone missing. If this assumption seems not strictly necessary on grounds of contents we shall see later that there are structural reasons which indeed strongly recommend a lacuna.

2.2 *Word Interpolation*

In addition to possible examples of major interpolations we may also consider cases where N omits single words present in A/Π and Λ: I. xiii. 13, xvii. 5, II. iii. 25, xiii. 49, xvi. 34, III. ii. 16, IV. i. 133, v. 2, viii. 31. Among these cases there are two (I. xvii. 5[79], II. xvi. 34[80]) where the text of A/Π and Λ is undoubtedly correct, and in two further cases the full text is in no way suspicious (IV. i. 133[81] and viii. 31[82]). In four cases however the A(Π)Λ-supplement is objectionable (I. xiii. 13, II. xiii. 49, III. ii. 16), and in the remaining one (II. iii. 25) one may at least wonder whether no better alternative is available.

I. xiii. 13: haec ego non rumore malo, non augure doctus
ego *om. N*

The line has been treated by Goold and he has shown convincingly that *ego* is an interpolation. While he first[83] opted for Rossberg's[84] *haec non sum rumore malo, non augure doctus* he later[85] considered favourably Baehrens's *haec cano non r- m- etc.* His objections against Rossberg's text are certainly not fatal[86], but as Dr Heyworth points out to me, *haec* is suspicious as well after the feminine *haec* in 9 and 11. He suggests *quae cano non* which is very likely to be correct.

II. xiii. 49: non ille Antilochi uidisset corpus humari
ille *om. N*

ille is a miserable line filler, which is extremely awkward after the preceding relative clause[87] and Müller's *non aut Antilochi u- c-*

---

[79] Quin etiam absenti prosunt tibi, Cynthia, uenti] tibi *om. N.*
[80] nec tetigit Campi, nec mea mensa iuuat] campi *om. N* (*add. s.l. N*[2])
[81] Tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo] tibi *om. N.*
[82] Altera Tarpeios est inter Teia lucos] est *om. N.*
[83] See Goold 1, 65.
[84] *Gymn. Progr. Stade* (1877), 8.
[85] See Goold 4, 291.
[86] Cf. II. xxiv. 2, which Goold himself adduces for the separation of the inverted auxiliary tense.
[87] *non ille*, similarly superfluous, is also found in IV. vi. 31; it is the relative clause in II. xiii. 47f. which makes all the difference.

h- [88] makes excellent sense and neatly accounts for the omission.

III. ii. 16: et defessa choris Calliopea meis
et *om. N; s.l. add. N²*

We need not bother to try to explain away the difficulties of the text with *et.* Baehrens's *nec* is clearly what we expect and Goold rightly prints Baehrens's conjecture. One may however wonder whether the absence of *et* from N is really due to interpolation in ΠΛ. *et* could easily have become *nec* by the common loss of the initial letter and the loss of *et* in N may be accidental.[89]

IV. v. 2: et tua, quod non uis, sentiat umbra sitim
uis *om. N; s.l. add. N¹*

Again puzzling case. *uis* is certainly most likely to fall out between *non* and *sentiat* and it is added in N by the first hand. Nonetheless, *quod non uis* is awkward and has been plausibly emended by Havet who writes *et tua, quod non tu, sentiat umbra sitim* (accepted by Hanslik).[90]

II. iii. 25: haec tibi contulerunt caelestia munera diui
tibi *om. N*

The full text does not present serious difficulties. On the contrary, at first sight the *anaphora haec tibi* (25) ... *haec tibi* (26) seems to be quite appropriate. However, after the preceding question starting with *num tibi* (23) the repetition of *tibi* in 25 is awkward and deprives the following *anaphora* of its effect. Palmer's *haec, haec* has a good chance of being correct.[91]

Looking back at these examples of single words missing in N, one notices immediately a great similarity among all but four of them. In five out of nine cases the omitted word is a pronoun, in fact, in three cases it is the pronoun *tibi.* One observes, of course, that in all cases the words omitted are quite short, most of them even prone to be written in abbreviation; one could thus explain their omission easily as accidental and one may even regard this as corroborated by the

---

[88] It has been accepted in Goold's Loeb edition (see also Goold 1, 65). *non aut* is not found elsewhere in Propertius, as Dr Heyworth points out to me, but this may be chance.

[89] Exactly the same corruption occurs in III. xxii. 6.

[90] It is easy to see why *tu* fell out before *sentiat. quod* can perhaps be defended (cf. Cic. *ad fam.* 2. 8. 2), but in the brachyological phrase it may seem to add unduly to obscurity and Broukhuyzen's *quam* has a good chance to be correct.

[91] Another *anadiplosis, non non,* recurs two lines below (27). Whether one regards this as confirmation of Palmer's text or finds the repetition of the same stylistic device in the immediate vicinity rather odd may be regarded as a matter of taste.

fact that the same word *tibi* is affected thrice by omission, in particular because in two of these cases the word is beyond suspicion. On the other hand it must be highly perplexing that in five out of nine cases the transmitted text is suspicious or plainly corrupt, and the substitution of a pronoun may also be seen as a facile, well documented device of interpolation.[92] One may even suspect that *tibi* in I. xvii. 5 and IV. i. 133 is an interpolation even if the text is correct.[93] In both cases *tibi* is certainly a supplement which everyone would be capable of making. In the first instance it is in fact the only possibility which makes sense.

The case for regarding the full text as interpolated is not particularly strong and one will find the evidence rather perplexing than decisive, but it is worth pointing out that in five out of nine cases the omitted word is the first or second in the line, and one could suspect mechanical damage of the ms. at the beginning as well as at the end of certain lines.[94] Significantly the three among the four cases of omission in the middle of the line (I. xvii. 5, II. xvi. 34 and IV. viii. 31) are three of the four unsuspicious ones.[95] In fact there is one notorious example of a possibly interpolated beginning of a line in II. xxx. 19:

> non tamen immerito! Phrygias nunc ire per undas...
> non tamen immerito *N*: nunc dura paras *FZMUR*: nunc tu d- p- *LPW*: nunc iam d- p- *TS²* : nunc qui d- p- *JK*: nunc .....d- p- *C*, *v. om.S spatio relicto, suppl. S²*

Scholars have always been divided over which text has to be regarded as genuine. The question cannot be decided with much confidence, because we do not have the context of the lines and thus cannot know which text fits this context better.[96] But Butrica has made a good case for regarding both supplements as interpolations.[97] Butrica assumes

---

92 Cf. Jachmann 1, I 135 (=540), II 199ff. (=564ff.), 'Caesartext und Caesarinterpolation', *RhM* 89 (1940), 182 (=218); for pronouns as intrusive glosses cf. e.g. Cat. LXIV. 139, Ov. *Fast.* I. 206, *Trist.* I. iii. 97, *Met.* iii. 458, also I. ii. 78, III. xiii. 1, *Ib.* 560, *Met.* i. 465, Hor. *C.* I. xxxiii. 6 and II. xvii. 25; from Greek texts e.g. S. *Ant.* 321, *OC* 444; see also Dörrie I 126, 134, 137 and passim, III 318; J. Diggle, 'On the *Orestes* of Euripides', *CQ* 40 (1990), 101 (= *Euripidea* [Oxford 1994] 363).

93 The only case where the full text cannot be an interpolation is II. xvi. 34; no interpolator could have hit on *Campi*.

94 In some cases, however, omission by oversight seems possible as well.

95 I suspect that in IV. i. 133 *tibi* is indeed interpolated; it has every chance of being correct but it is not, of course, the only possible supplement.

96 See above p. 31f.

97 P. 86f.

that ΠΛ read *nunc dura paras* which is of course unmetrical. This text may then have been interpolated differently in the common source of LP, of JK and T.[98] Yet I wonder whether C does not reproduce faithfully a lacuna in Λ and the archetype which FZ ignored whereas it was filled by an interlinear or marginal supplement *tu* in LP. S may have chosen to omit the line precisely because it was obviously defective. The agreement between LP and W could be due to contamination but it may well suggest that *tu* was already present as a variant in Λ and Π(A), i.e. in the archetype; it appears to have been partly ignored or rejected for another solution in the descendants of Π and Λ. Pondering the problem one should bear in mind that *non tamen* and *nunc tu* may well be different attempts to decipher a barely legible text.[99] We may assume mechanical damage at the beginning of the line, where some traces of the first two words (probably written in abbreviation) were still visible whereas the following word appears to have vanished completely.[100]

As regards the single words omitted in N, if interpolated, they could have entered Λ by contamination with Π.[101] However, we have already seen that contamination is unlikely at least for some lines missing from N[102], and IV. v. 2 rather suggests that even these cases may go back to interlinear variants in the archetype which N did not admit to the text and only exceptionally transcribed *supra lineam*. Λ distinguishes itself by the absence of most of the metrical and other interpolations of Π/A[103], and it sometimes even exposes interpolation

---

98 Heyworth in his unpublished thesis has reconstructed a common source for JKW; W may well have hit on *tu* independently of LP.

99 See Housman I 271; for the confusion *no(n) t(ame)n / n(un)c tu* cf. Dörrie I 130 (on Ov. *Her.* vi. 131).

100 A further possible case of mechanical damage at the beginning of a line (IV. xi. 18-20) has already been mentioned by Butrica (p. 24). For an illustration of how mechanical damage of the margin may occasionally affect an area immediately after the first letters of the lines cf. the Bodmer papyrus of Menanders *Dyskolos* (P. Bodm. IV; ed. princ. with facsimile by V. Martin [Cologny-Geneve 1958]) ll. 40, 137, 242f., 347, 541, 710ff., 761; cf. also corresponding cases at line-ends (89, 493, 594, 657, 686).

101 See below p. 94 n. 120.

102 See above p. 76ff.

103 Λ does not share the following metrical interpolations of A(Π): I. xxii. 8 (tu] et; *te* lost before *nu-*), II. ix. 38 (precor] quidem; *precor* lost before *pueri promite*), III. xxiv. 6 (esse] saepe; *esse* lost by haplography). Π's omission of *magno* in II. xxxiv. 40 (not shared by Λ, but *magno* was deleted in T) may also be due to metrical considerations (failure to recognise synizesis in *Capanei*, perhaps measured as two *longa* ; however *-gno* is likely to fall out before *grata*).
A number of places where the descendants of Π differ suggest that some metrical

exclusive to N.[104] The fact that for the lines in question the text of N does not scan might have prompted consultation of a Π—source by Λ, but on the other hand, if Λ had undergone a systematic revision of metrically faulty lines according to Π it is strange that Λ obviously does not adopt the text of Π in a case like III. v. 23f.:

atque ubi iam Venerem grauis interceperit aetas,
sparserit et nigras alba senecta comas
sparserit et nigras *C* (= *Pomponius Leto* ; sparserit *Z*^{ras}, nigras *Z*^{mg}): -erit

interpolations were added as supralinear variants in Π and most probably already in A: II. xxxiv. 4 (formosam] formam *P*$^{ras.}$: formaui *L* : et formam *FZ*; see Butrica 47, 51), III. iv. 22 (sacra] *om. L*: media *FPZ*), III. vi. 5 (uano nuntius esse] uanus esse *FL*: uanis esse relator *PZ*), III. xi. 14 (Maeotis] nectis *L*: iniectis *FZ*: neiectis *P*; I cannot accept Butrica's [51] explanation of the evidence: L's *nectis* is a most plausible corruption of *meotis* , and FZ's *iniectis* a feeble attempt to 'correct' the meaningless and unmetrical text; P's *neiectis* may be a conflation of *nectis* with *iniectis* written *supra lineam*), III. xiv. 19f. (capere arma] arma *L*: armata *PZ*: est armata *F*; F alone shows, in addition to the metrical emendation *armata*, an intrusive gloss, prompted by the failure to see that *fertur* need not govern *erubuisse* alone). These cases show one striking coincidence: L is closer to the correct reading of N than the other Π-mss. except that in one case it is joined by P (II. xxxiv. 4, *formaui* is hardly an interpolation [thus apparently Butrica 48], but a mere misreading of *formam*). To be sure the text of L (or LP/LF) is in all cases easily corrupt from that of (FP)Z but it is perplexing that L should in all these cases present an individual error descending from the interpolated text (it may be noted that L is not particularly prone to omission). Rather L (or FL) appears to exhibit an omission (of a whole word or a syllable), which led to interpolation in the other Π-mss. in order to restore the metre. In III. vi. 5 the accord between F and L gives the reading of Π, i.e. the defective text; the interpolation *relator* is confined to PZ and thus could have been exclusive to the source of LPZ (perhaps added as an interlinear or marginal variant), but in the other cases, where F shares the interpolation, the variants must already have been present in Petrarch's copy. The likeliest explanation for all five cases is that the interpolation was already present as a variant in Petrarch's copy. If the interpolations were the work of Petrarch they would not do him much honour, and that all these variants may well have been present already in A is suggested by an analogous case in the part where we still possess the ms.: in I. xvi. 6 *indignis* is omitted in the text but added in the margin by the scribe of A himself (that the interpolations in Π reach back beyond Petrarch has already been stated by Knoche 2, 264f. and Butler-Barber p. ixxx).

[104] N's *fertur* for *quamuis* (ΠΛ) in II. xxxii. 33 is the common interpolation of a verbal form (cf. IV. iv. 72 below p. 112; for *quamuis* with participle cf. Tränkle 1, 71). In III. i. 23 the text of ΠΛ (*omnia*) is unobjectionable whereas N's *famae* is extremely awkward and should not be defended as the *lectio difficilior* (thus Butler-Barber). Most probably N's *famae* goes back to an explicative gloss *fama* on *uetustas* which crept into the text and was them adapted to suit the syntax. Slightly harder to judge is II. xxxiv. 21: either N's *cur* for *qua* (ΠΛ) is an interlinear explanation or *qua* is an attempt to avoid the rare construction of *cur* with indicative. I definitely am inclined to the first alternative (for a similar case of an intrusive gloss on a relative pronoun cf. Ov. *Tr.* I. iii. 5). Otherwise I would rather expect *remitto* to be changed to *remittam* than *cur* to *qua*.

integras *T* (et *s.l. add.* er *postea exp.*) *P*^mg^ : -serit et integras *NSKWJMUR* : -sit et integras *Π*

Panormita noted the error and he corrected against Π; surely he did not find the reading in Λ.

But let us consider the distribution of interpolations in A/Π, N and Λ in a wider context. As I have said a moment ago, both N and even more so A/Π[105] show individual interpolation but there are no

---

[105] Metrical interpolations in A/Π are given above p. 88 n. 103. Clear examples of intrusive glosses are found in A(Π) in the following places: II. ix. 34, xxii. 7, xxvi. 41, III. xiii. 56, perhaps also III. i. 24 (may be graphical). Intrusion of connecting particles we find I. xvi. 47, III. viii. 17f. There are examples where Π presents a synonym and it is not absolutely clear whether its reading is due to an intrusive gloss or rather represents a banalizing amendment of the text (for an instructive list of such interpolations in the text of Seneca's tragedies see Zwierlein 42f.): II. xii. 12 and strictly parallel III. xxv. 8 (for similar cases from another author cf. Ov. *Fast.* v. 648, *Tr.* IV. iii. 22). There are many other examples for interpolations where the replacement is not quite synonym with the genuine text, for the problem in general see Willis 54f., Stout 120ff.; a useful list of examples from Martial is found in W. Heraeus, 'Zur neueren Martialkritik', *RhM* 74 (1929), 320f., for some Greek examples cf. S. *Ai.* 382, 615, 761, 1016; *OT* 542, *Ant.* 83, 1270; *OC* 166; for the distortions scholiasts are capable of cf. e.g. the scholion on E. *Hec.* 5: μοῖρα for κίνδυνος), 223f. (δεσπότης for ἐπιστάτης and ἐτάγη, ἐχειροτονήθη for ἐπέσται). From Propertius cf. further II. xv. 41. There is one documented example of a very similar interpolation in the indirect tradition where we clearly deal with a intentional variation of the text, hardly with a gloss in II. i. 58 (for the textual problems of the line see below p. 107f.). *habet* is obviously meant to be a stylistic improvement avoiding repetition (for word interpolation avoiding repetition cf. e.g. E. *Hec.* 564).
Intentional could be: II. xii. 3, II. xvi. 15 (the same interpolation Cat. lxxvi. 13; for similar interpolations from Greek texts cf. S. *OC* 69; one could also cite *Ant.* 699), II. xxii. 3 (cf. Ov. *Met.* vi. 174), IV. i. 28: we can hardly decide whether *facta* is an intrusive explanation supplying a verb or an emendation of the text; in the latter case beside the wish to supply a verbal form decency may also have played its part. For decency as a motive of interpolation see Günther 2, 24f., 44, 61f.; a notorious example in Latin is the recension 'in usum elegantiorum' (Lindsay 8f.) of Martial in α, cf. M. D. Reeve in *TT* 243 and the editions of Schneidewin p. LXXXV and Shackleton Bailey p. VIf. For interpolation designed to replace *nudus* see Dörrie III 319, cf. also Ov. *Fast.* II. 267 (nudos ... Lupercos *AUω* : modicos ... L- ζς). A clear example of intentional manipulation in Π for which decency but perhaps also ignorance may be responsible is found in II. xxii. 24. Rather amusing is II. xxxi. 3. For similar interpolations in the whole tradition see below p. 112.
Perhaps semiconscious alteration according to an Ovidian model is found in: I. i. 1 (*ex* Rem. 764), IV. ii. 2 (*ex* Am. i. 114; *signa paterna dei* is certainly a difficult phrase provoking alteration and probably it is indeed corrupt. One could consider Housman's *regna* for *signa*; but perhaps more has gone wrong [*signa fatente deo* Shackleton Bailey]; in any case, *pace* Hanslik the text of Π has no chance to be genuine).
Four clear cases of intentional variation of the transmitted text in A (Π) are found in I. i. 1 (banalization), viii. 45 (for the interpolation *summus* cf. e.g. Luc. II. 273, V. 696, IX. 541.), xv. 7 (*haec* inserted in order to remove *et* after *nec*; for the reading of Λ see

traces of intentional interpolation exclusive to Λ[106]. Metrical emendations shared by Π and Λ (against N) and by N and Λ (against Π), not however by Λ/Π and N against Λ. The common interpolations of ΠΛ are the following:

II. xviii. 5
quid mea si canis aetas canesceret annis, ...
quid mea si ... canesceret *N* : quid si iam ... mea caneret *ΠΛ* (caneret annis *om. C*)

Whether one accepts N's text with Heinsius's minimal emendation *candesceret* or not[107], it should be clear that *iam* in ΠΛ was interpolated after corruption of *canesceret* to *caneret* together with a normalisation of the word order.

III. vi. 9
si<cine> e<r>am incomptis uidisti flere capillis?
siccine *Tomacellianus*[108] : si *N* : sicut *ΠΛ* eram *Barb. 23*[109]

Butrica 76) and II. xvi. 39 (*insanus* renders the expression slightly more drastic; for interpolator's predilection for the spectacular see Ludwich 106; for examples of replacing a word by a slightly stronger expression in Latin poetry cf. e.g. Hor. *C.* I. iv. 8, III. xx. 1, Ov. *Met.* iv. 681,vi. 551, *Ib.* 177, Mart. VII. lxvii 3 and XIV. cxxv. 1; see also Dörrie III 319; from Greek poetry I cite only S. *Ant.* 223, 365). An interpolation which was presumably caused by a failure to understand the genuine text is found in III. xix. 4 (the author of *liberae* may have been puzzled by *captae mentis* in the sense of 'frenzy of the mind').

A last case of interpolation in Π is IV. xi. 79f. (aera *A* : et *LP, v. om. F spatio vacuo relicto, deest N*); here the situation is not only complicated by the absence of N but above all the genuine text has not been restored with much certainty, and I shall not attempt to interpret the transmitted variants. I only wish to point out that in IV. xi. 79f. emendation should in all probability start with the *aera/ et,* not with *regna.* Yet Scaliger's popular *Afra* (already found in the margin of Par. 8237) produces a strange expression, and *Afra ... regna* would oddly anticipate v. 37f. (*testor maiorum cineres tibi, Roma, colendos, sub quorum titulis, Africa, tunsa iaces*). One may guess that the divergence of the transmission is due to physical damage of the beginning of the line, and *aera* may be an attempt to decipher a barely legible text. Then we need not keep too close to the letters, and I think Pocchus' *uersa* (also in some humanist mss. according to Barber and Smyth but not reported in Hanslik) is not a bad guess.

106 See above p. 76.

107 Heyworth (1, 400f.) makes a good case against accepting *canis*, but I cannot follow his reconstruction of the archetype, which in my view is unnecessarily complicated. For a different view see Butrica 74f., who regards N as interpolated and accepts the text of ΠΛ with *canderet* for *caneret.*

108 Written in Naples (1440-50) by Leo Tomacelli, see Butrica 332. The reading is also found in several other mss. connected with the Tomacelli ms., i.e. in Butrica's group δ (Berlin 500, Berlin 41 and Pal. lat. 1652) and, according to Hanslik's apparatus, in Parm. 716, Valencia 725, Vienna 3163 and in the margin of T; Heyworth does not cite the reading in his collations, I therefore assume it is not by the first hand. Is it added by the second hand which Butrica (312) tentatively identifies as that of Pontano?

109 Signed by Paolo of Viterbo; see Butrica 299.

For *eram* see Shackleton Bailey 2, 147.

III. vii. 25f.
reddite corpus humo, posita est in gurgite uita;
Paete sponte tua, uilis harena, tegas.
est *N*: que *AΠ*

Butrica[110] argues for accepting the text of ΛΠ but stilistically N's straightforward parataxis is much better.[111]

III. xv. 31f.
ac ueluti, magnos cum ponunt aequora motus,
Eurus et aduersus desinit ire Noto...
et] sub *N*: in *ΠΛ* aduersus .... Noto] aduerso ... noto *N*: aduersos ... notos *ΠΛ*

I give the text as restored by Keil (*et*) and Postgate (*aduersus*) and printed by Goold. N and ΠΛ are affected by two different interpolations, *sub* or *in* (which necessitated further changes in case endings), designed to restore the metre after omission of a monosyllable between *Eurus* and *aduersus*. In restoring the original text we are not bound by the letters and Keil's paratactic *et* is surely superior to Lachmann's popular *ubi*, which awkwardly creates a second temporal clause.

Beside the common metrical interpolations listed above A/Π and Λ share also two other interpolations:

II. xxiii. 21f.
et quas Euphrates et quas mihi misit Orontes,
me iuerint: nolim furta pudica tori
iuerint *N*: capiant *ΠΛ* [112]

II. xxxii. 21f.
sed de me minus est: famae iactura pudicae
tanta tibi miserae, quanta meretur, erit.
mereris *AΠ*

A *prima facie* case of a commmon interpolation in Λ and Π is also IV. iii. 11

---

[110] P. 73
[111] Major corruption in 25 has been suspected by various scholars (see p. 39 n. 159 above) and if one accepts Damste's *aquae* for *humo* one could see a relict of the genuine text in *positaque*. However I do not feel that there is sufficient reason to expell *humo* and for the vocative required for *reddite* see above p. 39ff.
[112] For such interpolations rendering the expression slightly more drastic see above p. 91 n. 105.

haecne marita fides et †parce auia noctes†
parce auia *N* : pacatae mihi *TMURKWJ F* : pactae mihi *Z* : pactae iam mihi *P* : *om. S, spat. rel.*, et parce auia noctes *om. C*

In this case, however, the original text is beyond recovery and a different analysis of the transmitted readings has been proposed by Goold.[113]

Already Baehrens and Housman[114] have argued convincingly that N underwent metrical interpolation. In all cases they have adduced Λ shares N's text. In two cases NΛ present a word order in accord with the rules of Vergilian and Ovidian hexameter, violated by the text of Π:

II. iii. 27
non non humani sunt partus talia dona...
partus sunt *NΛ*

II. xxxiv. 23
sed numquam uitae me fallet ruga seuerae...
fallet me *NΛ*

Butrica adds a third, II. xiii. 17:

quandocumque igitur mors nostros claudet ocellos
mors nostros *P* : n- m- *NΛ F, deest L*

And there is a further similar case, II. xvi. 17:

semper in Oceanum me mittit quaerere gemmas
me mittit *P* : mitt me *N* : mittit me *ΛF deest L*

Baehrens further adduced II. xxx. 21 for the avoidance of enclitic *-que* after short *e*[115]:

spargereque alterna communis caede Penatis...

spargere et *NΛ*

I think the four strictly parallel examples II. iii. 27, xiii. 17, xvi. 17 and xxxiv. 23 demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt, that Π (or even P) alone presents the genuine text, and strong suspicion must fall on NΛ in II. xxx. 21 as well.[116]

At first sight this distribution of common interpolations among two members of the trio N, Λ and A/Π appears to support Butrica's assumption of a common source of N and Λ because there are no

---

113 See Goold 2, 34f.; cf. also the apparatus of his edition.
114 Cf. also Butrica 64f.
115 For such lines cf. Fedeli on III. xxi. 13.
116 For the elision *spargere et* see K.F. Smith (New York 1913) on Tib. I. ii. 72.

common interpolations in N and A/Π and the agreements between Λ and A/Π[117] are easily explained by contamination of Λ from Π. Influence of Π on Λ is not only plausible on historical grounds, as Butrica[118] has pointed out, T exhibits indeed marginal variants taken from F or its copy San Marco 690[119] and Λ even reads conjectures of Coluccio Salutati in the text,[120] and in any case common interpolations between Λ and A/Π could always have entered the archetype after N had been copied. Yet this assumption does not account very well for the three places where Λ differs from Π in the lacunae of N[121] and on closer inspection another hypothesis seems more likely.

If N and A/Π do not exhibit any common interpolations they share at least one error which cannot have arisen by accident[122] and which even Butrica has to explain as the survival of a variant in the archetype in Λ; as I have already pointed out repeatedly, Butrica himself has shown that the preservation of variants from the archetype in Λ is likely in a few other places.[123] Even if we admit contamination from Π the text of Λ was surely not corrected systematically against that of Π; a large number of errors of Λ remained uncorrected.[124]

Alternatively the significant agreements between any two members of the three branches N, Λ, A/Π (and even N and A/Π show at least one) may be explained by direct descendance of all three from an archetype furnished with variant readings. For the lack of common interpolations in N and A/Π an easy explanation offers itself: Λ appears to have chosen consistently the interpolated, i. e. emended text. All interpolations shared by N and Λ and most of the interpolations common to A/Π and Λ mend the metre and it is quite obvious why a scribe (or scholar) should have preferred them. If Λ indeed

---

117 Butrica's list of agreements in error between A/Π and Λ (see p. 72) is not complete, most agreements are insignificant but it should perhaps be mentioned that ΛΠ share three cases of faulty word order: beside III. xvi. 7 (the only case cited by Butrica) we find also II. xxxii. 13 (platanis creber pariter *N* : c- pl- pa- *LPSJKWMURC* : c- placanis pa- *F* : c- pa- pl- *T*) and xxxiv. 31 (memorem musis *N P*ᵃᶜ : mu- me- *ΠΛ*).

118 P. 66.

119 Written by Poggio Bracciolini and owned by Niccoli; see Butrica 226.

120 Cf. e.g. I. vi. 12 amare *Λ, Coluccius* : amore *NA*, xv. 28 quid *Λ, Coluccius* : quod *NA*).

121 See p. 76ff.

122 II. xxviii. 53; see Butrica 78f.

123 See Butrica 77f.

124 Why should anyone have bothered to alter e.g. the word order in III. xvi. 7 according to Π or adopt Π's interpolations in III. xv. 3 (praetexti *N* : praetexta *AΠ*) but leave such obvious errors which Λ shares with N as Butrica lists p. 75 uncorrected?

consistently chose to incorporate interpolated variants from the archetype it is obvious why significant agreements are fairly numerous between N and Λ or A/Π and Λ but rare between N and A/Π. Purely verbal corruption is less likely to produce significant agreements than interpolation. In contrast to N the heavily interpolated A/Π—tradition[125] appears to have been a little receptive to interpolations. It must, however, remain puzzling that N appears to have chosen four similarly motivated interpolations but hardly any others. Yet these interpolations which certainly have been made fully consciously and presuppose a high degree of metrical competence are surely of different origin from the others. Possibly they were written *in linea* text in the archetype whereas the genuine text was entered as a *varia lectio*. The A/Π/Λ—interpolations however were entered in the archetype as variants—perhaps later—and thus ignored by N; they could even have been entered after N or his exemplar were copied. The A/Π—tradition consistently incorporated the *variae lectiones* from above the line or the margin, which were regarded as improvements upon the main text, into its text, whether they were interpolations or, as in the four places where the archetype was interpolated *in linea*, the genuine text.

If this interpretation of the evidence is correct at least the common interpolations of N and Λ attest the presence of metrical interpolation in the archetype, and there can be hardly any doubt that the archetype was also heavily affected by metrical interpolation of the kind we could observe in A/Π/Λ.

In order to get a more precise picture of the character of the archetype it may be useful to try to list and to classify the cases where the whole tradition appears to be interpolated. I am conscious that the following list contains much which may be regarded as uncertain; yet in the text of Propertius so little is uncontroversial that hardly any conclusions can be drawn if one limits oneself to what is universally accepted. I trust that despite all uncertainties in most of the cases I shall present at least the analysis of the problem may find acceptance even if by those who reject the solution favoured by me. Moreover the collection of similar cases of corruption I shall attempt below will also entail a certain element of cumulative evidence which might lend support to some of the more questionable conjectures I shall commend.

As is apparent already from the documented cases of word interpolation by far the most frequent type of interpolation is metrical. In

---

[125] See p. 88 n. 103.

what follows I shall give a list of cases, where the transmitted text appears to have arisen from some kind of emendatory activity upon a metrically defective text. Perhaps I should say explicitly that I use the term interpolation in a rather wide sense with regard to any effect upon the text which is not purely mechanical but where some kind of intentional factor (if only a semiconscious one) is involved. In many of the cases listed below the transmitted text will have been created rather semiconsciously; in fact it will be seen that fully intentional rewriting of the text for its own sake is not much in evidence in Propertius.[126]

I. i. 33
in me nostra Venus noctes exercet amaras

Heyworth[127] has convincingly impugned the transmitted text (the problem had already been spotted by Housman who proposed *me non nostra V-*).[128] His proposal *nam me* has rightly been accepted by Goold. Surely, omission of *nam* (perhaps written in abbreviation) is responsible for the corruption. The interpolation may be inspired by v. 17, as Heyworth observes.[129]

Very similar is IV. i. 124:

et lacus aestiuis intepet Umber aquis

Housman's[130] *non tepet* surely is the most plausible emendation.[131] The corruption is due to abbreviation of *non.*

I. vi. 9
illa meam mihi iam se denegat, illa minatur

The awkward *meam*[132] could owe its existence to an interlinear comment *meam esse* on *mihi se denegat.* I do not know a suitable word to replace *meam* where it stands but I could think e.g. of *illa mihi sese iam denegat* or *illa mihi iam nunc se denegat.* In both cases the transmitted text

---

126 See below p. 113ff. In some of the cases listed below even a purely mechanical explanation is possible.

127 Heyworth 1, 394ff.

128 Against this see Heyworth 1, 396.

129 If *nam* was written in abbreviation *in* may even be a simple corruption (or perhaps rather a semiconscious emendation); this is certainly true for the reading *in* for *nunc* of the A-class in IV. i. 81, which Heyworth (1, 396) cites in support of his text.

130 Cf. Housman II 859.

131 Butler-Barber (*ad loc.*) prefer to provide *intepet* with a dative and write *agris* comparing Stat. *Theb.* ii. 376ff.

132 Shackleton Bailey (2, 271) cites Sen. *Contr.* VII. ii. 2; *mihi* in Propertius makes all the difference.

may also be a metrical emendation after omission of *se-* or *nunc* (written in abbreviation after *-m*).

I. ix. 13
i quaeso et tristis istos compone libellos

Although defending the transmission Shackleton Bailey[133] duly points out the pecularities of *compone.* His note provides the best arguments for reading *sepone* (easily corrupted by haplography) with Heinsius.

I. xviii. 27f.
pro quo diuini fontes et frigida rupes
  et datur inculto tramite dura quies

fontes and even more so *diuini* are simply the wrong words here. Heinsius ingeniously wrote *continui montes.* I regard this solution has highly likely,[134] and a very similar corruption (*ctinui* > *dinui* > *diui* > *diu<in>i*) may be seen in

III. x. 23
tibia nocturnis succumbat rauca choreis

There is not much point in *nocturnis* after *nox* in 21.[135] Housman suggested *continuis.*

I. xix. 17f.
quamuis longae te remorantur fata senectae,
  cara tamen lacrimis ossa futura meis.
te longae T^{pc}SJKWRFP

The parallel in II. xiii. 47 (cited below[136]) will induce one rather to accept Phillimore's *longae<uae>*[137] for *longae te* than to accept the transposition to *te longae* (thus silently editors).

I. xx. 7
huic tu, siue leges umbrosae flumina siluae,
  siue Aniena tuos tinxerit unda pedes
hunc *codd.* : *corr. Auratus*

Hoefft was the first to see that *Umbrae* has to be restored from *umbrosae,*[138] but Richmond's *Umbra<e rat>e* is surely superior to his

---

133 See Shackleton Bailey 2, 25.

134 Alternatively one may consider Enk's *cliuosi montes.* The corruption *montes* > *fontes* repeats itself further below in I. xx. 50 (cf. Shackleton Bailey 2, 58).

135 *noxque inter pocula currat.*

136 P. 101.

137 The rather rare word is certainly liable to corruption; it fits the equally obsolete *senecta* see Tränkle 1, 42.

138 That a place-name is required was already seen by Scaliger who suggested *Silae* for *siluae.*

Umbrae <*sacra*>. Even if one cannot feel absolutely certain about the supplement, there is hardly any doubt that *umbr*<*os*>*ae* is a attempt to restore the metre.[139]

Further below in the same poem Goold prints an ingenious conjecture of Heinsius:

I. xx. 29f.
ille sub extrema pendens secluditur ala
  et uolucres ramo summouet insidias.

Explanations of 29 by commentators only show the utter absurdity of the transmitted text. Heinsius wrote *ille sed extrema penden*<*te*>*s ludit* <*in*> *ala*. One may find this solution convincing or not; what is certain is that the transmitted text is the effect of considerable rewriting of a corrupt verse by a redactor.[140] And at least that a form of *ludere* lurks in *secluditur* seems highly likely to me.

II. i. 5f.
siue illam Cois fulgentem incedere †cogis†,
  hoc totum e Coa ueste uolumen erit

Instead of accepting Bartht's *hac* in v. 6 one may well be tempted to expell *hoc* alltogether and write *totum* <*d*>*e Coa* with Schrader and several *recentiores*.

II. iii. 15
nec si qua Arabio lucet bombyce puella

Despite Shackleton Bailey's[141] defence *qua* is most awkward in the context and *qua*<*ndo*> *Arabo* (Pucci, Garrod) too easy to renounce emendation. The same corruption is seen in II. vi. 12.[142]

II. iii. 21f.
et sua cum antiquae committit scripta Corinnae,
  carmina quae quiuis non putat aequa suis.
lyrines *TS u. l., MURC*

"...to say that an authoress thinks her own poetry better than another's is a rather dubious compliment." This comment of Shackleton Bailey[143] is exactly to the point but nothing is gained by making

[139] For the corruption *umbra* > *umbrosa* cf. also [Tib.] III. i. 16; there however the corruption is caused by the failure to see that *Castaliam* is an adjective.
[140] Attempts of commentators to explain the transmitted text only show its utter absurdity.
[141] See Shackleton Bailey 2, 65.
[142] See below p. 99.
[143] Shackleton Bailey 2, 66.

Corinna instead of Cynthia the subject of 22. In fact, 21f. are meant to be a rather dubious compliment expressed with a gentle touch of irony: Cynthia is quite fond of herself; of course, she does not think her poetry ranking with that of any mediocre contemporary, an ancient poetess like Corinna is just good enough to suit her self esteem. Barber's *quod quaeuis* gives the right sense, but stilistically I would much prefer a paratactic construction. I think *carmina enim quaeuis* fits the ironic tone particularly well.[144] Obviously, *enim* is likely to fall out behind *-mina* and *quae <qui>uis* may well be an attempt to mend the metre. Butrica[145] insists that we have to take into account *lyrines* in several Λ-mss. and regards both the reading of NΠ and that of Λ are remnants of a corrupt gloss *uel lyrices cuiusuis* on the name of a lyric poet.[146] However, I fail to see his point against regarding *lyrines* alone as corrupt from a displaced gloss on *Corinnae* in the preceding line. It is true that there is no other certain example of individual interpolation in Λ,[147] but we do not find interpolations common to N and A(Π) against Λ either.[148]

II. vi. 11f.
me laedet, si multa tibi dabit oscula mater,
  me soror et cum qua dormit amica simul.

Goold rightly spurns the vulgate *quae* (Dousa) in 11 and prints Alton's *qua<ndo>*.[149] Indefinite *quae* is not found in Augustan poetry except in Horace's Satires.[150]

II. ix. 13-18
foedauitque comas, et tanti corpus Achilli
  maximaque in parua sustulit ossa manu;
cum tibi nec Peleus aderat nec caerula mater,
  Scyria nec uiduo Deidamia toro.
tunc igitur ueris gaudebat Graecia natis,
  tunc etiam felix inter et arma pudor.

---

144 Heyworth objects that *enim* is not elsewhere found in a pentameter in Propertius, but this may be chance. *enim* is not a common word in Augustan poetry (see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* [Lund 1945], 122f.) and Propertius has only nine examples. It fits particularly well with the prosaic *quaeuis*; on *quiuis* and *quilibet* in Propertius see Tränkle 1, 163.

145 Pp. 77f.

146 Building on a conjecture of Beroaldus he suggests *carminaque Erinnae non p- ae-s-*.

147 See above p. 90f.

148 See below p. 91.

149 Commended also by Shackleton Bailey 2, 71.

150 Cf. Butler-Barber *ad loc.*

cui tum is Housman's emendation for the plainly impossible *cum tibi* in line 15.[151] We need only think of the numerous cases of interpolated pronouns in A(Π)Λ discussed above[152] to recognise that *tibi* is an interpolation designed to fill the verse after *cui tum* was corrupted by haplography to *cum*.

A further notorious problem lurks in line 18 where the offences of the transmitted text with *etiam* beside *et* have justly been censured by Shackleton Bailey.[153] I suspect that *etiam* is a gloss on *et* and there is indeed a parallel case in II. xxxii. 37[154] where NΠΛ read *etiam* for *et*, restituted in the Δ—mss. If *etiam* is ejected in II. ix. 18 we may consider two possible lines of emendation: either a verb is lost or one may think of a dative like e.g. *nuptis* or *uiduis*. The second alternative would have the advantage that we may thus keep the transmitted *natis* in line 17[155] as the following line would remove the ambiguity of the gender.

II. xiii. 37f.
nec minus haec nostri notescet fama sepulcri,
   quam fuerant Pthii busta cruenta uiri.

fuerant for *fuerunt nota* (after *notescet*) may be defended with reference to Hom. *Od.* vii. 69 (ὣς κείνη περὶ κῆρι τετίμηταί τε καὶ ἔστιν ...; adduced by Postgate), but *fuerant* may well be the relict of an interlinear supplement of a verb. If the genuine text read something like Alton's *quondam* for *fuerant* one may even think of omission of the word after *quam*; *fuerant* would be equally plausible as a supplement of a lacuna. The fact that we find two further interpolations in close vicinity[156] strengthens one's suspicion about the text here.

---

151 The parallels cited in commentaries to justify the change of address do nothing to defend the transmitted text as long as 15f. is a subordinated clause. Postgate's *Achille* in 13 has found favour with some critics but it is surely better to intervene in 15 than to introduce an unwanted address in 13. There Housman's *cui tum* is superior to Alton's alternative *tunc ibi*. *ibi* has no point and *tunc ibi* ... *tunc igitur* (15-17) is odd. Goold rightly prints Housman's emendation.

152 See p. 85ff.

153 Shackleton Baily 2, 81. *et* can, of course, be defended if we restore a second noun for *inter* to govern from *felix*, which has been regarded as superfluous. The best conjecture so far is Giardina's *caedes* (printed by Goold) and Heyworth suggests *famulas*, but it is wrong, in my opinion, to change the perfectly unobjectionable *felix*; in particular when no palaeographically easy emendation is at hand.

154 *hoc et Hamadryadum spectauit turba sororum.*

155 *nuptis* instead of *natis* is Baehrens's popular conjecture.

156 Vv. 47 and 49; see above p. 85f.

II. xiii. 47f.
quis tam longaeuae minuisset fata senectae
†Gallicus† Iliacis miles in aggeribus
quis tam] cui si *Bodl. Canon. lat. 31 (= Antonio Sinibaldo), Est. a. T. 9. 17*

tam is clearly an interpolation designed to fill the verse after corruption of *cui si* to *quis* regardless of the fact that the corrupt text does not make sense.[157]

II. xv. 39
si dabit haec multas, fiam immortalis in illis

If the verse is genuine[158] *haec* after *illa* in the preceding line can hardly be right, and Shackleton Bailey's *et* ('even') is as good as certain.[159]

II. xxvii. 6
et maris et terrae caeca pericla uiae

Goold[160] has rightly pointed out that we want a verb instead of the impossible *uiae*. In his edition he prints Smyth's *latent*.[161] Presumably not only *la-* was omitted after *pericla* but the whole word may have been lost and was replaced by a supplement inspired by *uia* in v. 2.

II. xxviii. 51
uobiscum est Iope, uobiscum candida Tyro

Antiope[162] has already been restored by the annotator of Ambr. I 67 sup.[163] *est* belongs to one of the most common types of interpolation.

II. xxxii. 5f.
cur tua te Herculeum deportat esseda Tibur,
Appia cur totiens te uia ducit anum?

For *uia [La]nu[ui]um* > *uia* <*ducit* >*anum* see Butler-Barber *ad loc.*

II. xxxii. 61f.
quod si tu Graias tuque es imitata Latinas,
semper uiue meo libera iudicio!

si tu es is Heyworth emendation of *tuque es* (reported in Goold's apparatus and rightly put in the text). *si* was lost after *Graias* and *-que*

157 Interpolators mending defective metre need not always be terribly keen on achieving good sense; for another example see below p. 107.

158 See however below p. 141, 155.

159 For the interpolation of pronouns see above p. 87 n. 92.

160 See Goold 2, 32.

161 Cf. Goold 3, 98 n. 4.

162 Cf. Fedeli's apparatus *ad loc.*; for the corruption of proper names see above p. 38 n. 157.

163 Cf. C. Pascal, 'Scolii Properziani', *Boll. di Fil. class.* 11 (1904-5), 40-2.

interpolated to suit the metre. The faulty prosody reveals the interpolator.[164]

II. xxxiv. 93f.
Cynthia quin etiam uersu laudata Properti –
hos inter si me ponere Fama uolet.

The anacoluth is hardly possible in the concluding distich of the poem. *etiam* could be an intrusive gloss explaining *quin* as *quin etiam*, and the intruder has replaced the verb. Barber's[165] *uiuet*, accepted by Hanslik, is a good guess. The word would even be likely to fall out before *uersu*, *uiu-* even more so after *quin*. *etiam* is facile line filler.

III. i. 13
quid frustra missis in me certatis habenis?

I have nothing to add to Heyworth's[166] treatment of the line; we must read *immissis* (Auratus) *me<cum>* (P).

III. ii. 1f.
carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem,
gaudeat in solito tacta puella sono.

Even if the couplet is interpolated[167] *ut* (found already in humanistic mss.) for *in* is very likely to be right. The asyndeton is awkward and *in* is a most plausible interpolation after omission of *ut* (after *gaudeat*) or may represent even an explicative gloss (*gaudere* + *in* is extremely well attested in christian authors of late antiquity[168]).

In II. xxviii. 40 and III. v. 14 we encounter two exactly parallel cases:

II. xxviii. 39f.
una ratis fati nostros portabit amores
caerula ad infernos uelificata lacus.

III. v. 14
nudus ad infernas, stulte, uehere rates.

Palmer's <*in*> *inferno* ... *lacu* in II. xxviii. 40[169] and Barber's <*in*>

---

[164] See above p. 84 n. 78.
[165] 'Sex coniecturae Propertianae', *Atti Accad. Prop. del Subasio* [Assisi 1957], 22.
[166] Heyworth 3, 200.
[167] See below p. 146.
[168] Cf. *ThlL* s.v.; Tränkle 1, 90.
[169] I prefer Palmer's less obvious text to Baehrens's *ad infernos* ... *locos* (or *domos* as Dr Heyworth suggests to me); the change of *in* to *ad* is due to *portabit*.

inferna ... *rate*[170] in III. v. 14 should need no comment. In the latter place nothing recommends to keep to the *ductus litterarum* and prefer Schrader's *at* (thus Fedeli) or the awkward *ab* (Camps after Vat. lat. 5177).[171]

A further metrical interpolation occurs in the following line of III. v (15):

uictor cum uictis pariter miscebitur umbris.

Goold[172] has convincingly argued for *cum uicto* (Willis) *p- miscetur <in> umbris* (Housman).

III. vii. 60
attulimus longas in freta uestra manus.

Oudendorp's *comas* may receive some support from the observation that *co-* in minuscule may easily disappear by haplography after *-a.*[173]

A possible case of metrical interpolation is also III. ix. 44

et cecinisse modis, dure poeta, tuis
dure] Coe *Vat. lat. 5174* (*a. 1464, s.l.*), *Burn. 242* , *Pucci*

If *dure* does not owe its existence purely to a reminiscence of II. xxxiv. 44,[174] which may have been added as a parallel in the margin, it may be interpolated after omission of *coe* before *poe-.*[175]

Two of the most obvious cases of metrical interpolation occur in the same poem at short distance and are strikingly similar:

III. xiii. 35
atque hinuli pellis totos[176] operibat amantis
humili *FLZ* : humili *K* : humilis *P*

---

170 *inferna* already Florence, Bibl. Naz. Magl. VII 1164 and Ambr. H 34 sup., *rate* a large number of humanistic mss.

171 Against *at* cf. also Shackleton Bailey 2, 144f.

172 See Goold 1, 79f.

173 In any case *comas* seems to me the only plausible suggestion made so far. One may also be inclined to intervene in *manus* rather than in *longas* if one remembers that corruption of the last word in the line is quite common in Propertius, see Heyworth 3, 203.

174 *inque tuos ignis, dure poeta, ueni.*

175 Thus Butler-Barber and Fedeli *ad loc.*

176 *totos* is highly suspicious though perhaps not impossible. If it is indeed corrupt certainty about the genuine text is hardly attainable; the best suggestion seems to me Shackleton Bailey's *iunctos* (cf. IV. vii. 19 [*pectore mixto*]; the motif is already found in Archilochos, fr. 196a, 45). Then *totos* may even be an intrusive gloss.

Scaliger restored *[atque] hinulei* from a Horatian parallel.[177]

III. xiii. 39f.
corniger atque dei uacuam pastoris in aulam
dux aries saturas ipse reduxit oues.

One cannot be quite certain about the correct text in 39, but that *atque* is interpolated after corruption of a proper name to *dei* is clear. Fedeli (*ad loc.*) has made a good case for Volscus' *Idaei* but Hertzberg's *A<rca>dii* is also plausible.

The same poem presents a third case

III. xiii. 61f.
certa loquor, sed nulla fides; neque enim Ilia quondam
uerax Pergameneis Maenas habenda malis.

uilia for *<enim> ilia*, found in Barb. lat. 23 and Cant. Add. 3394[178], is one of the best conjectures ever made in Propertius. Lucks' *mali* is equally necessary; we need a dative *Pergameneis* 'by the Trojans' to

---

[177] Cf. *C.* I. xxiii. 1; Nisbet-Hubbard *ad. loc.* reject Scaliger's conjecture, wrongly in my opinion. I fail to see why modern editors restore *hinnulei*; one may rather doubt whether we should not write *inulei* (thus Fedeli referring to *ThLL*, cf. his note *ad loc.*; see also Walde-Hoffmann s.v. *hinuleus*).
Since the detection of the phenomenon of metrical interpolation is traditionally linked to the name of N. Heinsius it may be interesting to compare Scaliger's note on this passage: "laborat a syllabis versus, sed τὸ atque additum a paedagogulis." He does not express himself very clearly, and we cannot be certain that he understood the reasons for the interpolation. He appears to say: "*atque hinul<e>i* or *atque hin<n>uli* (i.e. if we restore attested forms of the word) is unmetrical, but *atque* has to be expelled as an interpolation." One may compare his note on Catullus xxxvi. 10 where he quite rightly comments on the vulgate of his time *iocose et lepide* : "copula *ET* addita a correctoribus nam libri scripti non habent, ne antiqua quidem editiones." That Scaliger was indeed aware of the phenomenon of metrical interpolation can be seen in another note in his Catullus. On lxiv he comments: "non vacuus. namque ille tulit] Haec non minore incommodo ac illa superiora, accepta sunt. Vetus et scriptorum et excusorum lectio: Nonacrios. namque ille tulit. Sed τὸ ille additum ad fulciendum versuum. Itaque non difficilis est coniectura haec investigandi. Deest igitur prima syllaba in prima voce *nonacrios. Lege vero: Cranona erisonamque tulit etc." With this comment Scaliger clearly anticipates Heinsius' findings, and a similar note can already be found in his edition of the *Appendix Vergiliana* ; on *Cir.* 112 Scaliger writes: "Hospitioque seni] Hic additi sunt tibicines ad fulciendum versum hiantem. Sed fideliores sane omnes antiquitus excusi, qui habent: Hospitioque senis hypolydosa victo. Ut sane magno nobis adiumenta fuerit ad veram lectionem indagandam: Hospitio qua se uisus pelopeus auito/ Carpathium fugiens, et flumina Curetea/ Texerat."

[178] Vat. Barb. 23 is signed by a certain Paolo of Viterbo and exhibits also two other correct emendations: *nexerit* for *uexerit* in III. xi. 29, and the splendid *eram* in III. vi. 9 (see above p. 91f.). However Cambridge, Univ. Libr. Add. 3394 appears to be earlier (*c.* 1425-50 according to De la Mare; see Butrica 214).

balance *patriae* 'in the eyes of my countrymen' in 59.[179] As 65f.[180] clearly show, the example of Cassandra does not illustrate *sed nulla fides* but *certa loquor.* Propertius' desire is to be accepted by his fellow citizens as a true prophet (59); his point is not 'though I speak true nobody believes me, as Cassandra was fated not to seem truthful'. No, what he is saying is this: 'May I be accepted as a true seer! I speak the truth, yet nobody believes me. Cassandra too was right when she warned her country of Paris and people had better heeded her advice.'[181]

III. xvii. 37-40
ante fores templi crater antistitis auro
  libatum fundens in tua sacra merum.
haec ego non humili referam memoranda coturno,
  qualis Pindarico spiritus ore tonat.

Fedeli[182] and Goold rightly print Heisius' beautiful emendation *crater<e> antistes <et> auro* (with comma after *merum*).

III. xx. 4
tantisne in lacrimis Africa tota fuit?
tantis *Π*

The generally accepted *tantine* (Pontano, Pucci) *<ut> lacrimes* (Heinsius) is rendered certain by Tib. II. vi. 42.[183]

III. xxi. 27f.
persequar aut studium linguae, Demosthenis arma,
  librorumque tuos, docte Menandre, sales.

The awkwardness of the enallage *librorum tuos sales* has been admitted even by its defender Shackleton Bailey.[184] *librorum* however, he comments, is essential, because it stresses reading as opposed to declamation of the previous line. Yet I wonder whether to read the plays of Menander would be a likely scope of a journey to Athens. Surely his plays enjoyed wide diffusion and must have been available in Roman bookshops as well and we may be pretty sure that Propertius was quite familiar with them. I am surprised that Fedeli (*ad loc.*) holds it

---

179 *atque utinam patriae sim uerus haruspex* (59); cf. Goold 1, 94.
180 *ille furor patriae fuit utilis, ille parenti: experta est ueros irrita lingua deos.*
181 The error could easily be graphical (dittography of *ui-*) but interpolation seems more likely to me. Even the correction to *uilia* could be a lucky chance but in view of the other good conjectures by Paolo of Viterbo (see p. 104 n. 178) this is probably not the case.
182 See his comment *ad loc.*
183 *non ego sum tanti, ploret ut illa semel.*
184 See Shackleton Bailey 2, 209.

unlikely that a traveller to Athens could have seen revivals of Menander's comedies on stage. Whereas a Roman would hardly have had the opportunity to experience representations of Greek plays on stage at home,[185] Greek theatre was much alive in the Greek east and in Athens in particular well into the imperial period.[186] I regard it as much more plausible that Propertius imagined a journey to Athens giving him the opportunity to savour Menander's wit in life performances. Suringa's *libaboque* (> *liboque* by haplography) has rightly been accepted by Butler-Barber and Goold. If 25f. are deleted, as I think they should,[187] there is no need to alter *docte*.[188]

IV. ii. 51f.
tempore quo sociis uenit Lycomedius armis
atque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.

Goold[189] has argued convincingly for Morel's *quoque*. After the word was corrupted by haplography <*at*>*que* restored the metre.[190]

IV. iv. 33f.
o utinam ad uestros sedeam captiua Penatis,
dum captiua mei conspicer esse Tati!

There can be no doubt that Gronovius' *ora* for *esse* is correct. *esse* is clearly designed to mend a lacuna caused by the omission of *ora* between *-er* and *ta-*.[191]

IV. vi. 73f.
uinaque fundantur prelis elisa Falernis,
perque lauet nostras spica Cilissa comas.

I have nothing to add to Morgan's[192] and Goold's[193] treatment of the

185 For such a rare opportunity cf. Plut. *Brut.* 21, 5; cf. also *Ant.* 56, 6-7.
186 For the continuation of tragic performances in the imperial period cf. A. Dihle, *Der Prolog der 'Bacchen' und die antike Überlieferungsphase des Euripides-Textes, Sitzungsber. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1981, 2, pp. 28ff.
187 See below p. 146.
188 Aptly defended by Fedeli *ad loc.*
189 See Goold 1, 83.
190 Goold 4, 310 gives a different explanation which seems less likely to me.
191 I cannot understand how anyone can accept the transmitted *esse* in view of Gronovius' absolutely convincing emendation. The passive use of *conspicer* is hardly defended by Varro *frg. in Prisc. gramm.* 2. 284. 2 and Apul. *Flor.* 9 p. 32; in Sall. *Iug.* 45, 4 we should certainly write *conspicitur* if we assume the verb to be passive which is not certain. Tränkle (1, 63) who defends the transmission admits himself that the passage is much more difficult than examples for active use of deponentia in Propertius. Moreover, the transmitted text in IV. iv. 34 makes very feeble sense.
192 'Cruces Propertianae', *CQ* 36 (1986), 197f.
193 See Goold 3, 101f.

lines. We must read *perluat et* for *perque lauet* (a palmary conjecture made by an atomic physicist!). The transmitted text is an attempt to restore the metre after omission of *et.*

IV. viii. 15
huc mea detonsis auecta est Cynthia ab annis

<*ab*> *annis* for *mannis* (Beroaldus; corrupted by haplography) is a purely mechanical line filler without any regard for sense.

IV. ix. 35
fontis egens erro circaque sonantia lymphis

The transmitted text is not outright impossible, but Burman's *circ<um antr>a* [194] or Baehrens's *circ<um aru>a* have every chance to be right.

IV. x. 43f.
illi uirgatis iaculantis ab agmine bracis
torquis ab incisa decidit unca gula.

Schrader's *uirgatas maculanti sanguine bracas* is by far the most stylish and elegant correction[195] and has recently been printed by Goold. The corruption is due to erroneous word division. The transmitted text is the result of an inept attempt to restore metre (by interpolating *ab*) and some dubious kind of syntax.

IV. xi. 40
quique tuas proauo fregit Achille domos

qui tumidas is Goold's excellent emendation of this notorious *crux.*[196] *–que* is once again a thoughtless line filler after corruption of *tumidas* to *tuas.*

This survey shows a huge amount of metrical interpolation in the archetype.

In conclusion we may add a case where a missing half verse may have been supplemented by interpolation in the whole tradition[197], II. i. 58:

solus amor morbi non amat artificem

---

194 Printed by Goold.

195 Even Tränkle (1, 75) who defends the transmitted text admits that the transition from dative to genitive would be unique in Latin; IV. vii. 23 is certainly no support for this passage, *eunti* is a far too easy correction to consider seriously the abnormality *mihi* ... *euntis.*

196 See Goold 1, 86; 4, 318f.

197 There are also three places where the last word of the line appears to be an interpolation (II. i. 5: +*cogis* +; I prefer Barber's suggestion *iuuit*), II. x. 23 (again I think Barber's *tantum* for *carmen* is not a bad guess), III. iii. 48 (see Heyworth 3, 202f.).

The transmitted text has justly been rejected by Shackleton Bailey[198] who suggests *auxilium* instead of *artificem*. However, it has always been noted that the second half of the pentameter is identical with that of I. ii. 8.[199] If the transmitted text in II. i. 58 is preserved, the verse appears to be an intentional reminiscence of that in book I, and even if Shackleton Bailey's emendation is correct the similarity is so strong as to suggest an allusion to the intelligent reader.[200] Yet, whereas in I. ii. 8 the opposition *nudus—artificem* gives a delicate point to the word play *Amor— (non) amat* , II. i. 58, as it stands (or with *auxilium*), is completely pointless and would make a very dull allusion indeed. I wonder whether we should not regard *non amat artificem* in II. i. 58 as a facile supplement of a text loss at the end of the line, a supplement suggested by the similarity of the beginning of II. ii. 8 with that of II. i. 58.[201] Of course, the sense of the original line cannot have been all too different from that of the interpolation (v. 57[202] makes the general lines of thought quite clear). The original may well have read something like *solus amor morbi non habet* (habet *iam Flor. Par.*) *auxilium*. But there are other possibilities; e.g. *solus amor morbum nutrit et ipse suum* or *s- a- morbus fouet et ipse malum.*

In comparison with these numerous cases of 'emendatory' interpolation conscious rewriting of the text for its own sake is quite rare. However, apart from the two examples cited above[203] there is one

---

[198] Shackleton Bailey 2, 63f.; the transmitted text has been defended by Tränkle 1, 23 n. 2.

[199] With the transmitted text (*nudus Amor formae non amat artificem*) even the structure of the first half of I. ii. 8 corresponds to II. i. 58. I think, however, that Goold is right in printing Heinsius' *formam* in I. ii. 8; *formae* is a semiconscious slip inspired by *medicina figurae* at the end of the previous verse.

[200] That the verse may go back to a model in Gallus has been pointed out by Tränkle 1, 23; cf. also Fedeli on I. ii. 7.

[201] Word interpolation inspired by similar expression from the same or even other works is, of course, an extremely frequent type (for convenience I cite a few examples from Ovid's *Fasti* where the apparatus of Alton/ Wormell/ Courtney gives the source of the interpolation: I. 97, II. 71, III. 265, 861, IV. 511; cf. also Dörrie III 321ff.). The case assumed here for Propertius is also quite similar to the well known type of 'Konkordanzinterpolation' and the very frequent exchange of various formulaic expressions in the tradition of Homer which may affect half verses or whole lines (cf. e.g. *Od.* i. 80, 314, 356; iii. 247, 255; vii. 330; viii. 412, 459; ix. 353, 409). Here we can find also strictly parallel cases to the process assumed here for Propertius (cf. *Od.* xi. 390 and 615) and for an example from another author cf. the reading of Lγρ (ἐπηπείλης' ἔπη) in S. *Ai.* 650 (κἀγὼ γάρ, ὃς τὰ δείν' ἐκαρτέρουν τότε) which is inspired by v. 312 (ἔπειτ' ἐμοὶ τὰ δείν' ἐπηπείλης' ἔπη). In fact the taking over of complete half verses—eventually slightly modified—can also be paralleled from the three imitations of Propertian lines in the medieval Latin comedy *Pamphilus* cited in Butrica (pp. 22f.).

[202] *omnis humanos sanat medicina dolores.*

[203] P. 92.

certain and one possible documented case where the indirect tradition reveals an interpolation of the latter type in our mss. and in view of the very meagre testimony of the indirect tradition for Propertius this could be regarded as an indication of the quality of our text:

III. viii. 37f.:
at tibi, qui nostro nexisti retia lecto,
sit socer aeternum nec sine matre domus!
nexisti *Priscian.* (*GLK* 2. 536. 8), *Diomed.* (*GLK* 1. 369. 21), *Berol. Dietz B 57 (a. 1481), Est. α. T. 9. 17, P*[2ras.] : tendisti *rell.*

Here only the indirect tradition preserves the original reading *nexisti* whereas our mss. read the interpolation *tendisti* which replaces the rare perfect cited by the grammarians.

A similar case is perhaps III. xvi. 13f.:

quisquis amator erit, Scythicis licet ambulet oris,
nemo adeo ut noceat barbarus esse uolet.
Scythiae *CIL IV 1950* : siticis *F*[ras] *L* ambulet *inscr.*, *Λ* : ambulat *cett.*
adeo *inscr.*, *Itali* : deo *rell.* noceat] feriat *inscr.*

Goold, following M. E. Hubbard[204], recently prints *feriat* from a Pompeian wall inscription. Its testimony preserves the couplet certainly in a version superior to our mss.: in one place the inscription alone preserves the truth (also restored by conjecture in several humanistic mss.); in another case it joins Λ in a correct reading, and in two other places, where the inscription offers a different text, its version is at least possible. As regards the choice between *feriat* and *noceat*, the latter may be a banalizing interpolation or even a gloss. On the other hand *feriat*, if it is not simply a slip of memory, could be an attempt to render the expression more drastic. Certainty is hardly attainable. One may feel tempted to prefer the more drastic *feriat*; it suits *barbarus*.[205] On the other hand Professor Reeve rightly points out to me that one could also find *noceat* superior as it leaves more to imagination.

Non-metrical interpolations which affect the whole tradition are found in the following places:

Interpolation of a pronoun, very similar to the documented cases of omission in N, is perhaps seen in I. i. 11f.:

---

204 'Propertiana', *CQ* 18 (1968), 318.

205 *feriat* fits even better, if one accepts with Goold Schuchtermayer's transposition of 19-20 after 14. This text has its obvious attractions and has every chance to be correct, but the transmitted sequence is surely not impossible, not even, I think, offensive.

nam modo Partheniis amens errabat in antris,
ibat et hirsutas ille uidere feras

saepe, found in Vat. lat. 1611, for the transmitted *ille* has been approved by Shackleton Bailey.[206] Given that *ille* is indeed a rather likely interpolation *saepe* surely provides a plausible solution of the textual problem and there is certainly no need to go further and write *rursus in hirsutas ibat et ille feras* with Courtney[207] and Goold.[208] *uidere* has been explained satisfactorily by Shackleton Bailey. It adds a delicate touch of humour which I would not like to miss. The elegiac hunter is not after *hirsutas feras*, for him it is daring enough *lepores mollis excipere et structo figere auem calamo* (II. xix. 23f.). Alternatively one may accept Housman's lacuna, but this destroys the numerical pattern of the book and the surely deliberate correspondance in line number and structure between I. i and III. xxiv/ xxv.[209]

An intrusive gloss disfigures

I. ii. 9
aspice quos summittat humus formosa colores...

That *formosa* is impossible has been pointed out recently by Goold.[210] He prints Skutsch's *non fossa*, but if *formosa* is an interpolation we are not bound by the letters. I suspect that *formosa* may well go back to an explicative gloss *formosos* on *colores* suggested by *formosius* in line 11.[211] As regards the original text we can only guess, something like *non culta* (Allen and already Antonio Sinibaldi in Naples, Biblioteca Oratoriana dei Girolamini M.C.F.3-15) may well be right.

The same is possibly true for I. xi. 17

non quia perspecta non es mihi cognita fama,
sed quod in hac omnis parte timetur amor.

For the difficulty of *in hac parte timetur* see Shackleton Bailey 2, 35f. He voices sympathy for Lachmann's *ueretur* but objects to it being too far

---

206 Shackleton Bailey 2, 3.

207 Courtney 1, 255f.

208 Shackleton Bailey rightly points out that *saepe* receives some support from Ovid's imitation in *AA* ii. 187ff.

209 The fact that I. i and the last poem of the third book, III. xxiv/xxv, show the same number of lines has already been pointed out by C. Becker, 'Die späten Elegien des Properz', *Hermes* 99 (1971), 464; cf. also Goold (ed.) p. 347 n. 6; see below p. 139 with notes 39 and 41 for further discussion.

210 See Goold 4, 289.

211 For explicative glosses inspired by words of the immediate vicinity see Günther 2, 109.

from the *ductus litterarum*. *timetur* may well go back to a gloss *timet* (cf. *timoris* in v. 20).

II. iii. 49f.
sic primo iuuenes trepidant in amore feroces,
dehinc domiti post haec aequa et iniqua ferunt.

post haec is awkwardly repetitive after *dehinc* and *post* in v. 48; moreover *haec* has nothing to refer to. I suspect that *post haec* is an explicative gloss on the archaic *dehinc*.[212] As a replacement I suggest e.g. *faciles*.

II. xxxii. 35
quamuis Ida Parim pastorem dicat amasse...

Parim is a patent interpolation of the proper name, Goold prints Barber's *illam*.

III. xvii. 27f.
et tibi per mediam bene olentia flumina Naxon,
unde tuum potant Naxia turba merum.

Naxon is a patent gloss and Palmer plausibly restored *Diam*. Shackleton Bailey[213] who rightly rejects *Naxon* ... *Naxia* is quite wrong to object to *mediam* ...*Diam*. On the contrary, this kind of *adnominatio* is well attested and strongly recommends Palmer's text.[214]

IV. xi. 15
damnatae noctes et uos, uada lenta, paludes...

noctes has been exposed by Goold[215] as an interpolation. He writes *tenebris*. *noctes* presumably goes back to a gloss *nocte*.[216]

A further case of the intrusion of an explicative gloss has been suspected recently in IV. xi. 73 (*nunc tibi commendo communia pignora natos*) by Butrica.[217] His text (*Paulle* for *natos*) has been accepted by Goold[218], but Heyworth[219] has convincingly defended *natos*.

A further case of the same type is possibly II. xxxii. 23f.:

---

212 See Tränkle 1, 4.
213 See Shackleton Bailey 2, 192.
214 Cf. C.A. Lobeck, *Paralipomena Grammaticae Graecae* (Leipzig 1837), 54f., *id.* (Berlin 1866) on S. *Ai.* 61, E. Wölfflin, 'Das Wortspiel im Lateinischen', *SBAW* 2 (1887), 192. Further material in Häussler, *Das historische Epos* (Heidelberg 1976), I 285 Anm. 109; for Vergil cf. Pease (Cambridge Mass. 1935) on *Aen.* IV 54; Propertian examples are collected by Shackleton Bailey himself (2, 192 n. 2).
215 Goold 1, 85 and 2, 37.
216 Goold *loc. cit.* gives a different explanation; cf. also Goold 4, 310.
217 Butrica 201.
218 Goold 3, 105.
219 Heyworth 2, 47.

nuper enim de te nostras me laedit ad auris
rumor, et in tota non bonus urbe fuit.

me laedit ad aures may be intelligible but is an extremely odd phrase and must fall under heavy suspicion. What we want is clearly something like *peruenit* (thus already a few humanistic mss.[220]) or *descendit* (Lechner). Barber's facile *te laedit* will not do. Not only is the phrase *te laedit ad nostras aures* in itself hardly less awkward than the transmitted text, *te* is extremely odd after *de te.* Goold prints Schneidewin's clever *maledixit,* but surely this is not what we really expect here. Much better is Heyworth's ingenious *nostra maledicitur aure* which may well be right. Alternatively *me laedit* may go back to an interlinear explanation *te laedit* inspired by 21f. When it crept into the text *te* was changed to *me.*

As a last, though even more uncertain case of an intrusive gloss, one may mention III. vi. 5f.

omnis enim debet sine uano nuntius esse,
maioremque timens seruus habere fidem.

Muret's *metu* for *timens* (printed by Goold) decisively improves upon the transmission and surely deserves to be mentioned in a critical apparatus but cannot be proved necessary.

IV. iv. 71f.
illa ruit, qualis celerem prope Thermodonta
Strymonis abscisso fertur aperta sinu.

fertur is a clear case of supplying a verb; for Hertzberg's *pectus* cf. Tib. I. iv. 18, Ov. *Her.* xv. 122.

Decency may have played a role in the interpolation we read in IV. vi. 75:

ingenium positis irritet Musa poetis:
Bacche, soles Phoebo fertilis esse tuo.

Goold rightly prints *potis* with several humanistic mss. Adoption of this text here favours Rossberg's *potabitur* in IV. iv. 47:

cras, ut rumor ait, tota pugnabitur urbe...

Rossberg's text is surely superior to Housman's colourless *pigrabitur* preferred by Hanslik and Goold.

---

[220] Francesco Maturanzio in Casanat. 3227 (written 1468-72; the reading is also in its copy Groningen 159; see Butrica 152f., 235ff., 292f.) and Harley 5246 (see Butrica 153f., 257) and Vat. Chigi H IV 123 (Butrica 302).

This is a short and not very impressive list, but in conclusion it must be pointed out that apart from the cases collected above the transmitted text of Propertius is affected to a rather large degree by intentional or semiconscious emendation which defies classification. I have in the preceding tried to assemble cases of interpolation which fall into definable categories of word interpolation and thus may help us to form a clearer picture of the nature of the transmitted text; and I hope that if several of the conjectures advocated above will seem rather uncertain to some their insertion into a general frame will at least provide some further support for the solution proposed.

The archetype of Propertius which emerges is clearly not much disfigured by frivolous attempts at changing the transmitted wording as the transmission of more well read authors such as e.g. Ovid amply testifies; conscious rewriting of the text of Propertius for its own sake is hardly in evidence. Intentional interference with the text limits itself to mostly rather dull attempts at healing by minimal change obviously faulty, i.e. metrically defective passages.[221] The overall effect of such emendatory efforts on the text however should not be underrated. It is conspicuous, as Professor Reeve has pointed out to me, that the archetype of Propertius presents rather few *uoces nihili* if compared e.g. with that of Catullus, and normally the transmitted text even exhibits an, however shaky, syntactical cohesion. That the emendatory activity discernible in the text is of a very low quality is

[221] The cases of metrical interpolation listed above show that the archetype of Propertius was particularly prone to omission of small words; indeed there are plenty of further examples which show the carelessness in omission of letters or syllables, in particular at the beginning of words; cf. e.g. I. iv. 14 discere] dicere; 26 decus] deus; vii. 16 me uiolasse] eu-; viii. 7 pruinas] r-; ix. 30 tu fuge] <a>uf-; x. 11 concredere] concedere; xx. 47 et] om.; II. i. 31 Aegyptum] cyptum; iii. 45 ei] <aut>; vi. 31 tenebris] terris; viii. 13 ergo ego tam] ergo iam; 30 Teucris] tectis; xiii. 25 sat magna est] sit magna; xiv. 29 a te est] a te; xv. 37 si [in]terdum] tecum; xviii. 5 candesceret] canesceret (see above p. 91); 9 descendens] decedens; xxii. 5 aliqua in molli] aliqu<is> m-; 44 heu nullo pondere] e<t> nullo ponere; xxxii. 5 cur tua te] curuate(m); 8 tibi me] time(o); 13 platanis surgentibus] p- u-; III. ii. 5 Thebanas] thebam; 24 aut tacito] aut ictu; vi. 9. eram] eam; 20 poena et] poenae; vii. 22 poena Athamantiadae] p- m<in>anti<s> aquae; 29 curuate] curuae; ix. 55 claustra] castra; xv releuatus] uelatus; xvi. 14 adeo] deo; xvii. 17 spument] numen; xx. 5 adeo es] deos; xxi. 6 exsomnis] ex omni; 8 amicta] amica; xxii. 2 isthmos] i/ysmos; 15 olorigeri] orige (see above p. 51); 28 furit unda] fuit una; IV. i. 19 celebrante] celebrate; ii. 3 ego et Tuscis] ego t-; 39 curuare] curare; iii. 34 chlamydas] gladios; iv. 32 formosa] famosa; 39 secuisse] saeuisse; 55 spatiorne] pa(t)riane/ue; v. 64 mihi] om.; vi. 3 serta] cera; vii. 48 ardente e] ardent e; 81 spumifer] pomifer; viii. 37 uitrique] utrique/uterque; ix. 24 ubi] ab; 40 uastas] uatas/ natas; 60 unda] una; 66 accipite] accipit; x. 31 Veiens] ueius; 39 at] a; 41 Brenno] rheno; 42 e rectis fundere] erecti/ effecti f-; xi. 24 corripere ore] corripiare; 52 Claudia] gaudia.

abundantly illustrated by the above list of metrical interpolations and the general picture could be amply confirmed by further examples. The overall appearance of the text suggests, in my opinion, that it is the result of a collective uncoordinated effort of scribes rather than of the redaction of one or few individuals. However, the effect of this uncontrolled emendatory activity in an author as badly transmitted as Propertius and completely unprotected by a learned tradition was devastating. Although it must be said that intentional or at least semi-conscious factors probably play a much larger role in the corruption of ancient texts in general than may sometimes be recognised, the impact of this kind of corruption in Propertius is particularly great, and it is this factor which creates the greatest problems in diagnosing and emending verbal corruption in this author.

In the praefatio of his Loeb text[222] Professor Goold has chosen two examples from the opposite end of the spectrum in order to illustrate the problem.[223] I shall present another one which stands in the middle and seems to me particularly suited to highlight our difficulties:

III. xviii. 19f.
Attalicis supera uestes, atque omnia magnis
gemmea sint ludis: ignibus ista dabis.

The passage has been emended by Housman to *ostra <s>ma<ra>gdis gemmea sint Indis*. Starting from Housman's text it is perfectly obvious how the transmitted words arose, and the 'emendation' of the corruption we read in the transmitted text need not even have been made fully consciously in every detail. Yet in order to restore the original it needs not only the acumen of Housman; even to appreciate the quality of his splendid conjecture appears to be not as easy as one might think. A transmitted text of the sort which is in evidence here invites the critic to acquiesce in what he has before him and encourages him not to try to be more intelligent than the scribe. And the amount of rewriting necessary to arrive at a convincing solution will cause one to feel the ground shifting under one's feet. In fact, even Shackleton Bailey[224], who duly points out that the transmitted text is inacceptable, comments: "I have no remedy to offer. Housman's is the best of those proposed, but corruptions of the magnitude it as-

---

[222] See Goold (ed.) 20.

[223] A slight perhaps semi-conscious alteration III. xi. 5 (*uentorum morem* > *uenturam mortem*) and an interpolation according to an Ovidian parallel, II. xii. 18: *si pudor est, alio traice tela, puer* > *si puer est, alio traice puella tuo* (~ *supprime tela, ... puella tuo AA* iii. 735f.).

[224] See Shackleton Bailey 2, 199.

sumes call rather for an obelus." And when I state that I regard Housman's text to be one of the most compelling solutions of any major textual difficulty in Propertius I must remind myself that I might feel inclined to apply Shackleton Bailey's comment to a similar emendation by Heinsius in I. xx. 29 cited above[225], an emendation Professor Goold chose to print it in his Loeb text.[226]

2.3 *Dislocation and Interpolation*

In our discussion of III. xi. 57ff. above[227] we have suspected that the dislocation of a couplet might be connected with interpolation. As dislocation seems inevitably to indicate that a line (or lines) were absent at one stage from part of the tradition one should think that this phenomenon provides as good evidence for interpolation as the omission of verses in parts of the tradition. Because the connection between dislocation and interpolation is less well known,[228] it may be useful to assemble first a few well documented examples of the process from other authors.[229] In passing it may be mentioned that dislocation is sometimes associated with the intrusion of parallel versions, and I have discussed a particularly clear example of the process, E. *Med.* 725ff., some time ago.[230] In these cases, however, the dislocation may be due to the desire to combine the two alternative versions into a continuous text, and such cases are left aside here.[231]

---

225 See p. 98.

226 Further emendations which pose similar problems are e.g. Housman's *foliis Nemorensis abundans* for *socii Nemorensis ab unda* in III. xxii. 25 or Jacob's *uirgatas maculanti sanguine bracas* for *uirgatis iaculanti ab agmine bracis* in IV. x. 43 (see above p. 107).

227 See p. 74ff.

228 See however Ludwich 105; I briefly discussed the examples from Vergil's *Aeneid* in my paper 'Zwei Binneninterpolationen im zehnten Buch der "Aeneis" und das Problem der Konkordanzinterpolation', *Hermes* 124 (1996), 205ff.. Examples from Plotinus are collected in my forthcoming paper in *Eikasmos* on textual problems in Plotinus VI 9.

229 The connection between omission and dislocation in part of the tradition, independent of the problem of interpolation, may be studied e.g. in Hall's (*Prolegomena*) tables pp. 97-99 for omissions in Claudian.

230 Cf. Günther 2, 21ff.

231 I may further mention two cases in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (I. 544 ff. and VII. 144 ff.) where spurious verses are partly omitted or transmitted in different places. In both cases we are clearly dealing with parallel versions, and a case has been made for regarding them as author's variants. I am sceptical in general towards the notion of author's variants present in the ms. tradition until reasonable criteria are established for distinguishing such variants from interpolations (see below p. 127 n. 288). To my mind it seems *a priori* much more likely that we are dealing with simple interpolation, which is a phenomenon well attested elsewhere in Ovid.

Let us look first at some cases where there is clear ms. evidence for the process. We can start with four examples from Homer:

Il. xx. 223-4:
τάων καὶ Βορέης ἠράccατο βοcκομενάων,
ἵππωι δ' εἰcάμενοc παρελέξατο κυανοχαίτηι.
[ἐν μαλακῶι λειμῶνι καὶ ἄνθεcιν εἰαρινοῖcιν.]

The spurious verse printed here after 224 is only found in this position in Allen's **g**$M^8M^{10}V^{10}$; **l** puts it after 223 and the vulgate omits it.

Od. i. 93-9:
πέμψω δ' ἐc Σπάρτην τε καὶ ἐc Πύλον ἠμαθόεντα,
[κεῖθεν δ' ἐc Κρήτην τε παρ' Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα, 93a
ὃc γὰρ δεύτατοc ἦλθεν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,] 93b
νόcτον πευcόμενον πατρὸc φίλου, ἤν που ἀκούcηι ...

The spurious verses 93a/ b are only transmitted in part of the tradition: **b**BrKR^7R^{10}**e** have them in the position printed above, in one of Allen's[232] mss. (Mon.) they are added in the margin by a second hand, and his R^{12} places them after 102.

Od. i. 146-9:
τοῖcι δὲ κήρυκεc μὲν ὕδωρ ἐπὶ χεῖραc ἔχευαν,
cῖτον δὲ δμωιαὶ παρενήνεον ἐν κανέοιcι,
κοῦροι δὲ κρητῆραc ἐπεcτέψαντο ποτοῖο.
[νώμηcαν δ' ἄρα πᾶcιν ἐπαρξάμενοι δεπάεccιν.] 148a
οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖραc ἴαλλον.

Various mss.[233] present 147-9 in a different order (147-9 PHM; 148, 147, 149 FBCDT; 147, 149, 148 W; for 148a see below), and the spurious verses 148, 148a (= γ 339-40) are missing in part of the tradition (148 om. GSΠ1024; 148a is in H^mM; in Cu it is inserted between 148 and 147).

Od. xi. 603-4:
τέρπεται ἐν θαλίηιc καὶ ἔχει καλλίcφυρον Ἥβην.
[παῖδα Διὸc μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἥρηc χρυcοπεδίλου.]

604 is interpolated from Hes. *Thg.* 952. The verse is missing in Van Thiel's PHH^sΠ1102 and 1102a, and it was declared spurious by some critics according to the scholia. According to Allen's apparatus his family **c** and R^8 put the verse after 626. This case shows the possibility of dislocation of a spurious verse over a rather long distance.

---

232 The spurious verses are not reported in the new edition of Van Thiel (Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1991).
233 I cite mss. according to the apparatus of the new edition of Van Thiel.

A further case is found in Hesiod's *Theogony*, where the probably spurious verse 19[234] is absent from a papyrus (Solmsen's Π18) and transmitted in the rest of the tradition in three different places (after 15 K; in its correct position after 17 only in another papyrus, Solmsen's Π2, and in S, but after 19 in the vulgate).

Another example is

E. *Med.* 784-6
πέμψω γὰρ αὐτοὺς δῶρ' ἔχοντας ἐν χεροῖν,
[νύμφῃ φέροντας, τήνδε μὴ φεύγειν χθόνα,]
λεπτόν τε πέπλον καὶ πλόκον χρυσήλατον·

The spurious verse 785, fabricated on the basis of 940, 943 and 950 and already deleted by Valckenaer, is absent from Hn, and A places it after 786. I think it is quite likely that the verse was indeed intended to stand after 786 and supply the two accusatives with their own verb.[235] However this may be, the combination of omission and dislocation of a spurious verse in the ms. tradition is clear.

There is a further case in Euripides (*Hec.* 754ff.)[236]

Αγ. τί χρῆμα μαστεύουσα; μῶν ἐλεύθερον
αἰῶνα θέσθαι; ῥᾴδιον γάρ ἐστί σοι.
Εκ. οὐ δῆτα· τοὺς κακοὺς δὲ τιμωρουμένη
αἰῶνα τὸν σύμπαντα δουλεύειν θέλω.
Αγ. καὶ δὴ τίν' ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐπάρκεσιν καλεῖ!;
Εκ. οὐδέν τι τούτων ὧν σὺ δοξάζεις, ἄναξ.
ὁρᾷς νεκρὸν τόνδ' οὗ καταστάζω δάκρυ;

Part of the ms. tradition omits either 756-7 (RfRw) or 756-8 (MBOGKRT^{z}) or 756-9 (P. Oxy. 26 3B. 48/C[1-2]a [ined.], Diggle's Π^{7}); some of the mss. which omit 756-8 in the text have the verses in the margin (B^{2m}G^{m}K^{m}T^{tm}), and one ms. (F) places the passage after 779 (F^{2} adds it *in margine*). The omitted verses have long been suspected (756-8 del. Nauck, 759 Hartung), but Diggle rightly deletes only 756-7;[237] 758-9 are perfectly in place, except that the order must

---

234 There is no obvious mechanical reason for the displacement of 19 and we are certainly better off without this verse. Probably 17 is spurious as well.

235 For this type of interpolation see Günther 1, 63 n. 34; for the omission of more verses than just those which are spurious cf. Luc. vii. 257. See note 237.

236 On the relation between dislocation and omission in the text of Euripides see also J. Diggle, 'On the Manuscripts and Text of Euripides *Medea*', *CQ* 33 (1983), 351-3 (= *Euripidea* [Oxford 1994] 266-268).

237 For examples where the omitted verses do not correspond exactly to the spurious passage see also Jachmann 4, 405ff. (= *Ausgewählte Schriften* 453ff.), Dörrie 190ff., Courtney 3, 16ff.

clearly be reversed.[238] Whatever the reason for the displacement of 758-9,[239] the behaviour of F is again testimony to the displacement of spurious verses. This case is of special interest because it attests the possibility of a displacement over rather a long distance.[240]

There is further evidence for spurious verses being partly omitted, partly displaced in mss. in Latin authors.

Verg. *Ae.* vi. 240-2:
talis sese halitus atris
faucibus effundens supera ad conuexa ferebat.
[unde locum Grai dixerunt nomine Aornum.]

The spurious verse 242 is transmitted in its correct place only by R and b, γ places it before 241 and the rest of the tradition omits it.[241]

Further examples are offered by Ovid. Two particularly clear cases are found in the *Ibis*. Vv. 133-134, transmitted in their proper place in GPP_1EV_1 (sigla and verse numbers after La Penna), are interpolated after 40 in $TVHP_2$, after 44 in Z, and in reverse order after 43 in A. A patently interpolated distich, not even printed in the text in modern editions, is found after 130 in the main tradition, after 132 in FVA.

There are further cases in the *Heroides* :

v. 21-26:
incisae servant a te mea nomina fagi,
et legor Oenone falce notata tua,
et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt;
crescite et in titulos surgite recta meos!
[populus est, memini, fluuiali consita riuo,
est in qua nostri littera scripta memor]

The spurious distich 25-26 is missing in FGP; the rest of the tradition places it either after 22 or after 24.[242]

xvi. 165-8:
praeposui regnis ego te, quae maxima quondam

---

[238] This was already seen by Hirzel, who defended 756-7, placing a lacuna between 757 and 759.

[239] Presumably the order was reversed intentionally in order to integrate the interpolation of 756-7.

[240] Cf. above p. 116. For the connection between interpolation and dislocation one may also cite E. *Alc.* 863, where παῖ βῶ (del. Nauck) is transferred after παῖ cτῶ in R.

[241] A few further, less obvious cases of dislocated interpolations in the *Aeneid* are discussed in my article on interpolation in the *Aeneid* cited above (n. 228).

[242] See Dörrie I 202f.

pollicita est nobis nupta sororque Iouis.
dumque tuo possem circumdare bracchia collo,
contempta est uirtus Pallade dante mihi.
[cum Venus et Iuno Pallasque in uallibus Idae 168a
corpora iudicio subposuere meo.] 168b

168a/b are omitted by DFGGnMzPSpVW and placed after 174 in M (in some mss. further spurious verses follow 168b).[243]

I refrain from writing out two cases in the fourteenth letter (61-64 and 113-114) which have been discussed in detail by Dörrie.[244]

Further examples are found in Lucan, Juvenal and Statius:

Luc. vi. 554-7:
nec cessant a caede manus, si sanguine uiuo
est opus, erumpat iugulo qui primus aperto,
[nec refugit caedes, uiuum si sacra cruorem]
extaque funereae poscunt trepidantia mensae.

V. 556 is missing in N and stands after 557 in G.[245]

Iuv. xi. 162-6:
forsitan expectes ut Gaditana canoro
incipiant prurire choro, plausuque probatae
ad terram tremulo descendant clune puellae.
[spectant hoc nuptae iuxta recubante marito
quod pudeat narrare aliquem praesentibus ipsis.]

The spurious verses 165-6[246] are transmitted in this place only in PA, GTU omit them and in the other mss. they are found in quite different places dispersed over a considerable space (after 159, 160, 161 [*inuerso ordine* in O], 162, 171, 172, 202).[247]

---

243 Cf. Dörrie I 206 and the apparatus of his edition (*Texte und Kommentare* 6, Berlin-New York 1971); one may further cite *Her.* xvi 266ab, for which see Dörrie I 200 and his apparatus *ad loc.*

244 See Dörrie III 306; cf. also ix 81 with Dörrie's discussion (III 291).

245 See Fraenkel 524, who takes this as a case for author's variants, but the similarity with Sen. *Tr.* 301f. does nothing to defend 556; Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart 1988) rightly accepts Housman's deletion. Cf. also Luck 2, 263.

246 See Courtney *ad loc.* (who deletes the whole block 165-70 with Ribbeck), and he may well be right. An example of the omission of part of a spurious passage only is offered by N's behaviour in Stat. *Theb.* ii 37. Cf. also p. 117 n. 237.

247 Cf. also Claud. *DRP* ii. 118, omitted or added in the margin in numerous mss. (see Hall's apparatus) and placed, completely irrationally—after 119 in U. The spurious verse interpolated after III. 279 in many mss. is also found inserted after 280 and 281 in several copies (see Hall's apparatus). Disturbances of the verse order in conjunction with omission are also seen in I. 139-141; there however the situation is more complicated (see Hall *ad loc.*).

A particularly interesting example of the dislocation of a longer interpolated passage is found in Statius' *Thebaid*, where vi. 227-233 are omitted in Pω and transposed after 219 in μK.[248]

Examples of dislocated interpolations can be multiplied if we add cases where an interpolation is clearly not designed to occupy the position in which it is transmitted. I refrain from writing out other examples and list only some cases from Greek tragedy; from Euripides: *Hipp.* 663 (*del.* Barrett) was clearly intended to follow 666; *Andr.* 397-8 (*del.* Hartung) should presumably follow 404; *El.* 360 (*del.* Barrett) must be put before or preferably after 357, and *Ion* 1275-8 (*del.* Diggle) belong after 1281. There are further cases in Sophocles: *El.* 428-30 (*del.* Morstadt), probably belonging after 384, 957 (*del.* Wunder; an interpolated name) after 955, and *OT* 246-51 (*del.* Wecklein) after 272.[249]

In looking for dislocated interpolations in Propertius it may be best to assemble examples of the same type, because there may again be a certain element of cumulative evidence to be considered. Perhaps the most convincing part of Jachmann's and Knoche's research on interpolation seems to me Jachmann's demonstration of the type of 'Schlußinterpolation', which is a type of interpolation well attested elsewhere.[250] One of Jachmann's examples of this type, II. vi. 41-42, is indeed connected with a dislocation, and we might therefore start collecting a few cases of dislocated 'Schlußinterpolationen'.[251]

Beside the example just mentioned, II. vi. 41-42, I think a case can be made for regarding two further distichs as dislocated interpolations of the same sort: I. xvi. 11-12 and II. xviii. 21-22. The prime example surely remains II. vi. 41-42[252] which has been treated satisfactorily by Jachmann[253] and does hardly need further discussion. It will suffice to say that the couplet is acceptable at the end neither of vi nor of vii. vi. 37-40 as well as 19-20 are typical conclusions. Thematically vi. 41-42

---

[248] Further possible examples of dislocated interpolations in the same work include ii. 37-40 (see previous note) and the much discussed passage iv. 716-22.

[249] To mention at least one example from Latin poetry cf. Ov. *Fast.* v. 273-4.

[250] This type of interpolation is very widespread, and I cite here only a few particularly instructive examples from Greek tragedy: S. *Phil.* 504-6 (*del.* Reeve), E. *Andr.* 1279-82 (*del.* Stevens), *El.* 1097-1101 (*del.* Nauck), *Ion* 830-1 (*del.* Dindorf), *IA* 373-5 (*del.* Dindorf), 749-50 (*del.* Hartung). See also Tarrant 150ff.; Günther 2, 50ff., in particular 51 n. 129.

[251] Another convincing case of 'Schlußinterpolation' adduced by Jachmann is II. xxiii. 23f. and two further example have been added by Knoche: III. ii. 1-2 (see below p. 146) and xix. 27-28.

[252] I completely fail to see the merit of Luck's proposal ('Notes on Propertius', *AJP* 100 (1979), 77f.) to regard the lines as the beginning of vii.

[253] See Jachmann 3, 185f..

is clearly linked to elegy vii and certainly composed for the end of this poem, not the preceding one.[254]

Let us consider next I. xvi. 9-14:

nec possum infamis dominae defendere noctes,
  nobilis obscenis tradita carminibus;
nec tamen illa suae reuocatur parcere famae,
  turpior et saecli uiuere luxuria.
has inter grauibus cogor deflere querelis,
  supplicis a longis tristior excubiis.

11-12 had already been suspected by Lachmann, who later preferred to transfer them to the end of the poem (i.e. after 48). He may well be right on both counts. In this instance perhaps the case for interpolation seems perhaps even stronger than that for transposition. The zeugma in the construction of *revocatur* is particularly harsh[255] because the construction of the two infinitives is exactly reversed and thus is not covered by examples such as Luc. iv. 316ff.[256] But the distich is also hardly tolerable in its transmitted position between the closely connected distichs 9-10 and 13-14, where *has* (13) needs to come immediately after *noctes* (9).[257] In particular, if 11-12 are interpolated,

---

254 This was already seen by Scaliger.

255 Shackleton Bailey (2, 47) considers as an alternative the possibility of making *vivere* dependent on *parcere*, but this would be an even harsher zeugma than that involved in the construction of both infinitives with *revocatur*. For a survey of the various attempts to construe or to emend the line see also Fedeli *ad loc.* Fontein's palaeographically plausible emendation *purior* for *turpior* (accepted by Enk) has rightly been rejected by Butler-Barber as not yielding fully convincing sense ("Fonteine's *purior* for *turpior* cuts the knot, but 'to live more purely than the luxury of the age' is not altogether convincing in point of sense").

256 Shackleton Bailey, defending the text, cites Housman (*ad loc.*), who adduces a number of examples for double construction of verb + infinitive, none of which is truly parallel to our case. Much better is Shackleton Bailey's own example *non mortem, sed dum Darei corpus sepeliant, dilationem mortis deprecantur* (Just. 11. 9. 14). But there the reversal of the construction is much easier, because there are two neatly opposed objects *mortem* and *dilatationem mortis*.

257 If 11-12 are expelled, there is no advantage in adopting *haec* (sc. *carmina*); on the contrary *has* (sc. *noctes*) fits 13f. much better. I cannot see how Fedeli can be justified in objecting to *inter noctes*, because examples for this use of *inter* can easily be found in Kühner-Stegmann I 551 b) or indeed in *ThlL s.v.*, to which Fedeli refers. *has* has rightly been retained by Barber and Hanslik.
Recently Goold has printed Scaliger's *has inter grauius c- d- querelas* in 13 and Housman's *uoces* for *noctes* in 9 (see Goold 2, 32). I still fail to see what is wrong with *noctes* (i.e. the door complains that it cannot ward off the *infamia* of such *noctes*; cf. also Enk's note *ad loc.*), and Scaliger's text, neat as the correction may seem, does not make good sense. It would be inept to distinguish the following complaints of the door from the preceding ones as *grauius*; 15ff. speak of exactly the same situation as 5-10. In any case, deletion of 11-12 renders emendation in 13 unnecessary.

one cannot see how they could be destined for their transmitted place, they fit however very well after 48[258] as an elaboration of the *dominae uitiis* in the concluding distich.

Yet a strong precaution must be made. However convincing the excision of 11f. may seem if judged in isolation it meets with a formidable obstacle: any interference with the transmitted number of lines in book I (except for vii. 23f.[259]) destroyes the striking numerical symmetry of the book structure demonstrated by Courtney.[260] One cannot feel confident about any deletion in the *Monobiblos* without due regard for the numerical structure and I shall discuss the problem further below.[261]

Our next example is II. xviii. 19-22:

at tu etiam iuuenem odisti me, perfida, cum sis
 ipsa anus haud longa curua futura die.
quin ego deminuo curam, quod saepe Cupido
 huic malus esse solet, cui bonus ante fuit.

Here again transposition as well as deletion has already been suggested. 21-22 certainly appear to be the concluding couplet of a poem but fit ill at the end of xviii B; the preceding couplet 19-20 as well seems to conclude a poem,[262] and 21-22, in no way connected with 19-20, would be a most awkward appendix. Goold alone among modern editors appears to have fully realised the problem, and he divides the distich off as a fragment (his xviii C; 21-37 are his xviii D). Yet there is a straight thematic connection between the distich and the fragment xviii A (1-4):

Assiduae multis odium peperere querelae:
 frangitur in tacito femina saepe uiro.
si quid uidisti, semper uidisse negato!
 aut si quid doluit forte, dolere nega!

21-22 would fit directly after 4, and this transposition has already been suggested by Scaliger[263]; it is regarded with some sympathy by Butler-Barber. However, the thought expressed in 21-22 is still slightly strange: we should perhaps rather expect *malus* and *bonus* to change places, as was suggested by Guyet. If one realises that the

---

[258] *sic ego nunc dominae uitiis et semper amantis/ fletibus aeterna differor inuidia* (47-8).

[259] See below p. 131.

[260] See Courtney 1.

[261] See p. 140.

[262] Cf. especially II. xxxiii. 21-22, III. viii. 37-40, xi. 71-72, xv. 43-46, also I. vii. 25-26, xiii. 33-36, xvii. 25-28, II. xxiv. 51-52, xxviii. 59-62.

[263] He connected the passage with the preceding poem (see above p. 18 n. 58).

distich is part of the highly fragmentary passage II. xviii[264] one may not be all too surprised if the distich were dislocated for purely mechanical reasons, and one may even feel tempted to accept Guyet's text. Still, the conjunction of dislocation and a textual offence which would well be tolerable in an interpolation justify the suspicion that the couplet is spurious.[265]

A second type of interpolation which can be found in displaced lines is that of 'Vervollständigung'.[266] It can perhaps best be illustrated by taking first two examples where deletion and/or transposition has already been suggested. One is III. xxii. 37-38[267] which was sufficiently discussed by Knoche.[268] The couplet is impossible in its transmitted position, if only because of the lack of syntactical connection; it seems to belong after 30[269] and supplements the series of *exempla*, rather ineptly, but surely not ineptly enough for an interpolator.

A close parallel is found in I. xv:

I.xv. 13-24
et quamuis numquam post haec uisura, dolebat
  illa tamen, longae conscia laetitiae.
Alphesiboea suos ulta est pro coniuge fratres,
  sanguinis et cari uincula rupit amor.
nec sic Aesoniden rapientibus anxia uentis
  Hypsipyle uacuo constitit in thalamo:
Hypsipyle nullos post illos sensit amores,
  ut semel Haemonio tabuit hospitio.
coniugis Euadne miseros elata per ignis
  occidit, Argiuae fama pudicitiae.
quarum nulla tuos potuit conuertere mores,
  tu quoque uti fieres nobilis historia.

Certainly 17f. has to follow directly upon 14 and there is no doubt about the necessity to transpose 15-16 after either 20 (Markland) or

---

[264] See above p. 32f.

[265] In fact the distich has been suspected by Barber in the apparatus of his edition.

[266] Cf. Tarrant 137ff.

[267] *Arboreasque cruces Sinis, et non hospita Grais/ saxa, et curvatas in sua fata trabes.*

[268] See Knoche 1, 38ff., who does not see, however, that the couplet is dislocated. In spite of his brusque rejection of Knoche's deletion Fedeli's (*ad loc.*) thorough discussion of the difficulties amply shows why the lines must be highly suspicious. He is, of course, absolutely right to stress that an interpolator could hardly have been stupid enough to leave the distich without syntactical connection.

[269] Thus Hertzberg according to Postgate. Knoche's (1, 45f.) objections against this and against Otto's transposition after 10 (accepted by Hanslik) are valid whether the distich is by Propertius or not.

22 (Lachmann).[270] But quite apart from the dislocation, the killing of her brothers by a loving wife is quite out of place among the positive examples of women's fidelity cited in 9-22, and it is particularly strange that Propertius should have inserted here, if it fits so badly into the context, a version of the myth of Alphesiboea so rare that it is nowhere else attested.[271] One may also note that the three *exempla*, Calypso, Hypsipyle and Euadne are arranged in a series of decreasing length (6 lines for Calypso, 4 lines for Hypsipyle, 2 lines for Euadne[272]) which marks a crescendo in dramatic intensity: Calypso remembered her parting lover for a long time thereafter (15f.); Hypsipyle after Jason's departure never succumbed to another love (19f.); Euadne dies with her husband (21f.). This movement is destroyed by a fourth couplet. P. Pescani[273] may well be right to expel the lines on Alphesiboea altogether.[274] Yet again I cannot feel confident about this deletion in view of the numerical symmetry of book I.[275]

The following case may also belong in this context:

IV. ii. 31-38
cinge caput mitra, speciem furabor Iacchi;
   furabor Phoebi, si modo plectra dabis.
cassibus impositis uenor: sed harundine sumpta
   fautor plumoso sum deus aucupio.
est etiam aurigae species Vertumnus et eius
   traicit alterno qui leue pondus equo.
sub petaso[276] pisces calamo praedabor, et ibo
   mundus demissis institor in tunicis.

---

[270] Otto's transposition after 10 (accepted by Hanslik) is much less likely.

[271] The objection to 15-16 is not the fact that the version of the myth in which Alphesiboea kills her brothers is not attested elsewhere but rather that there is no reason for Propertius to chose such a story here. An interpolator, however, may merely have confused this story with one like that of Meleager (for a similar mistake by an interpolator see Knoche 1, 39ff. on Prop. III. xxii. 37-38, on which see p. 123), and the bloody tale may well have suited the taste of interpolators with their predilection for the sensational.

[272] For the structural gains of the deletion see also below p. 139.

[273] 'Un distico interpolato nella elegia 15ª del primo libro di Properzio', *SIFC* 15 (1938), 323-8; against L. Alfonsi, 'Ancora sull'elegia XV del primo libro di Properzio', *SIFC* 17 (1940), 125-35. Pescani is hardly right in his explanation of the mythical version chosen by the interpolator, which rests on a dubious interpretation of a fragment of Accius (cf. also the preceding note).

[274] A further parallel to these two cases of enriching a series of mythical *exempla* by interpolation is II. xxviii. 21-2, rightly deleted by Knoche. Here again the story is strikingly inept between the examples of deifications of girls suffering from unfortunate consequences of love affairs (cf. also Fedeli's apparatus *ad loc.*).

[275] See below p. 141.

[276] For the text see Goold 1, 77f.

35 is a much emended line, but no solution fully convinces. Even if *Vertumnus* is removed, the phrase *est ... species* remains awkward.[277] Surely, *species* should not be removed (cf. 31), but minor changes like Heinsius' *fert ... speciem* or *est ... specie* are still unappealing. Much better is Phillimore's *est ut in au- speciem uertamur.* This creates a phrase in line with 31ff. and 37f.: we want the first person and we need an expression of the type 'I am x if I am adorned so and so'. Yet one may wonder whether Phillimore's neat but not altogether easy emendation is worth the trouble. *est ... species Vertumnus* is more an odd than an impossible phrase. *species* is obviously borrowed from 31. Equally, *pondus* in 36 is slightly awkward, but hardly objectionable enough to justify emendation.[278]

Goold saw that 35-36, interrupting the closely connected distichs 33f. and 37f. are dislocated and transposes the couplet after 32. He also expresses sympathy with Fontein's deletion.[279] He is probably right on both counts.

A further series of interpolations may be introduced by II. xxii. 11-12. This is again a case where the suspicion of spuriousness is particularly strong.[280]

II. xxii. 7-14:
interea nostri quaerunt sibi uulnus ocelli,
  candida non tecto pectore si qua sedet,
siue uagi crines puris in frontibus errant,
  Indica quos medio uertice gemma tenet.
quae si forte aliquid uultu mihi dura negarat,
  frigida de tota fronte cadebat aqua.
quaeris, Demophoon, cur sim tam mollis in omnis?
  quod quaeris, 'quare' non habet ullus amor.

Enk was right in transposing 11-12 after 2; not only because it complements the contents of 1-2[281] (especially *mala*) more aptly than that of 5-10; 13 fits much better after 10 than after 12. The close coherence between 5-10 and 13, which is interrupted by 11-12, also tells against Fontein's lacuna before 11 (accepted by Fedeli). In particular the tense of 11-12 is only right after 2. Of course, we have to emend *quae si* with Enk to *si quae*; *quae si* cannot stand either if the couplet remains in its transmitted place, and no interpolator could have

---

277 *uestitus* Richmond, *cum uerbere* Postgate (approved by Goold 1, 78).
278 Goold 1, 78 argues for Schrader's *corpus.*
279 Cf. Goold 2, 30 n. 17 and (ed.) *ad loc.*
280 The couplet had already been deleted by Housman and is rightly bracketed by Barber.
281 *Scis here mi multas pariter placuisse puellas;/ scis mihi, Demophoon, multa uenire mala.*

joined the couplet so ineptly when other possibilities were obviously available.[282] Still, the couplet is odd and at least unwanted even after 2, and there are stylistic offences: instead of *uultu...dura* we should rather expect *uultu duro*,[283] and *tota (fronte)* is awkwardly superfluous. And if Enk's *si quae* is indeed correct we may remind ourselves that indefinite *quae* is not attested in Augustan poetry except in Horace's satires.[284]

A case very similar to the previous one occurs in IV. viii. 15-22:

huc mea detonsis auecta est Cynthia mannis:
  causa fuit Iuno, sed mage causa Venus.
Appia, dic quaeso, quantum te teste triumphum
  egerit effusis per tua saxa rotis!
turpis in arcana sonuit cum rixa taberna;
  si sine me, famae non sine labe meae.
spectaclum ipsa sedens primo temone pependit,
  ausa per impuros frena mouere locos.

That 19-20 are intolerable in their transmitted position can be taken for granted.[285] Luetjohann's transposition after 2[286] is at first sight very convincing and has indeed been adopted by Butler-Barber, Hanslik and Goold. It is clear at any rate that the couplet cannot find any other place in the poem. However, there are serious oddities in the text arranged in this way, which have been pointed out by Shackleton Bailey.[287] He regards the verses as a relic from a previous version by Propertius himself, as the couplet "does not read like an interpolator's work". It is true that there are no objections to the distich in itself, but the theory of an author's variant is at least as speculative as the assumption that the lines are interpolated. There is no proof that the fourth book was edited posthumously, and even if it was this does not prove the existence of author's variants: it makes it

---

282 After 10 *quod si*, which is already found in humanistic mss. according to Barber (not mentioned in Hanslik's apparatus), would be a possibility, but even there Enk's *si quae* is preferable. The transmitted text could be defended if we place the couplet after 24 with Camps and Goold, but there it does not fit the train of thought. It would be completely unconnected with the preceding and with the following passage (Goold obviates the lack of connection with an incorrect translation of 11).

283 Cf. e.g. I. xvi. 23, Sidon. *carm.* viii. 6.

284 See above p. 99.

285 See Butler-Barber *ad loc.*

286 *Disce quid Esquilias hac nocte fugarit aquosas,/ cum uicina nouis turba cucurrit agris* (1-2).

287 Shackleton Bailey 2, 254f. Cf. also Tränkle 1, 180 n. 1.

just a possibility;[288] but the absence of the lines from some copies, as is indicated by their dislocation, is better explained if they are interpolated, and the close parallelism with the preceding example—in both cases the first distich is supplemented by some further concrete information—makes interpolation in both cases rather likely.

A third case of exactly the same type of interpolation is perhaps the distich II. xvii. 13-14 discussed above.[289] We have already pointed out that the couplet is intolerable in its transmitted position, but wherever it is placed it remains slightly unsatisfactory. The obvious place for the lines is surely after v. 2, as Housman saw. Yet we had to reject this transposition, because the couplet would interrupt the link between 1-2 and 3-4. Moreover, Camps has rightly objected to *in nostras ... manus* in 14, and his conjecture *in nostram ... necem* has been accepted by Goold.[290] Rather than a corruption, *in nostras ... manus* is a facile line-filler inspired by *infectas ... habere manus* in v. 2. 13-14 are an explanatory interpolation strictly parallel to xxii. 11-12.

Another example of an interpolation after the first distich of a poem is perhaps found in III. xv. There however the situation is a little more complicated.

---

288 The whole question of the presence of author's variants in the texts of classical authors is a notorious problem which deserves a fresh treatment on a wider basis. Jachmann's fundamental paper on Ausonius could still serve as a starting point for such a study (see also the summary of the discussion in the light of recent investigations in the ms. tradition of this author in R.P.H. Green's (Oxford 1991) edition and commentary); for a more recent study of similar problems cf. M. D. Reeve, 'Author's Variants in Longus', *PCPS* 195 (1969), 75-85; see also my remarks on author's variants and postumous editions in antiquity in my forthcoming monograph *Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Vergils* Aeneis (to be published shortly as *Hypomnemata* 113). Further authors of particular interest would be Lucan, Juvenal and Martial. The problem should also be addressed by further study of the working technique of ancient authors as it presents itself both from direct information and from the few remaining autographs; for an excellent recent discussion of the working technique of ancient authors see T. Dorandi, 'Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut: Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den Antiken Schriftstellern', *ZPE* 87 (1991), 11-33, who on pp. 19ff. gives a list of the few ancient autographs which may have been preserved. I must, however, warn most emphatically against the widespread error of regarding the faultlessness of alternative versions as proof of that they descend from the author himself. The only serious attempt so far to establish criteria which would distinguish author's variants from interpolations are to my knowledge Fraenkel's remarks on Lucan in his review of Housman's edition (522ff.).

289 See p. 20.

290 See Goold 4, 299f.

III. xv. 39-46:
Antiope, cognosce Iouem: tibi gloria Dirce
ducitur in multis mortem habitura locis.
prata cruentantur Zethi, uictorque canebat
paeana Amphion rupe, Aracynthe, tua.
at tu non meritam parcas uexare Lycinnam:
nescit uestra ruens ira referre pedem.
fabula nulla tuas de nobis concitet auris:
te solam et lignis funeris ustus amem.

There can hardly be any doubt about the attraction of Vulpius' transposition of 43-44 after 10. The verses fit absolutely perfectly in this place[291] and dispense us from assuming the otherwise necessary lacuna between 10 and 11.[292] In their transmitted place 43-44 are certainly not impossible as regards their connection with what precedes, but if they are retained where they stand they should certainly form the end of the poem, and 45-46 are most inappropriate after this distich. The trouble with Vulpius' transposition is that 45-46 fit even less well after 42 than they do after 44. In fact after 42 the distich is downright impossible. Fischer's attempt to transpose both distichs 43-44 and 45-46 in reverse order between 10 and 11 produces a not impossible but certainly not fully convincing text. 43-44 fit better directly after 10 than after the interposition of 45-46, because 43-44 continue the theme of the poet's previous love, Lycinna, whereas 45-46 refering to the future would be a most awkward excursus if placed between 10 and 43.

Yet Fischer's suggestion has the merit of showing that 42 is indeed a perfectly convincing conclusion, and neither 43-44 nor in particular, 45-46 are needed at the end of the poem. Otto proposed to transfer 45-46 after line 2.[293] There the distich sits slightly better than after 10, but even so a promise for the future is not really appropriate in any place in this poem, which deals exclusively with Propertius' previous love and Cynthia's needless jealousy. Surely the transmitted sequence is preferable to the interposition of 45-46. I wonder, however, whether 45-46 may not be an interpolation designed to stand after line 2. The statement of fidelity to which *sic* (1) refers is some way off and does not follow until lines 9-10 after an excursus about

---

[291] The transposition has rightly been accepted by Goold; cf. also H. D. Jocelyn, rev. Luck, *Properz und Tibull*, *Gnomon* 37 (1965), 373.

[292] *cuncta tuus sepeliuit amor, nec femina post te/ ulla dedit collo dulcia uincla meo. testis erit Dirce tam uano* (*Franz*: uero *codd.*; see Shackleton Bailey 2, 187; Fedeli *ad loc.*) *crimine saeua* ... (9-11).

[293] *Sic ego non ullos iam norim in amore tumultus,/ nec ueniat sine te nox uigilanda mihi.*

the poet's love life before Cynthia. 45-46 may well be a feeble attempt to give *sic* an immediate reference.

A last example of this type of interpolation is perhaps found in the notorious opening elegy of the fourth book:

IV. i. 87-88:
dicam: 'Troia cades et, Troica Roma, resurges',
  et maris et terrae longa sepulcra canam.

There is no doubt that these verses are intolerable in their transmitted position. Various transpositions have been proposed. Recently L. Müller's transposition after 52[294] has been advocated again in a most ingenious paper by Murgia.[295] The couplet would thus be part of Cassandra's prophecy, continued in 53-54,[296] and Murgia finds this confirmed by what he sees as an imitation of 87-88, 53-54 (in this order) in Ovid *Fast.* i. 523-6.[297] He further argues that Propertius owes his inspiration for the passage to the famous lines on Rome in Lycophron's Alexandra; *dicam*, he claims, translates the opening of Lycophron's poem λέξω. Yet first of all, *dicam* and *canam*, or even, as Murgia emends, *cano*, are most awkward in the mouth of the speaker of a prophecy and the recourse to Lycophron does nothing to defend *dicam*. Lycophron's λέξω τὰ πάντα νητρεκῶς ἅ μ' ἱστορεῖς is quite different from a naked *dicam*; and if this were not enough, the oddity is emphasised in the following verse by *canam* or, as Murgia wants, *cano*. Moreover, the idea that Propertius should have brought together in one distich the opening of the *Alexandra* and a passage some twelve hundred lines later seems rather strange to me. Murgia[298] is conscious of the fact that the passage in Lycophron may be an interpolation; I think S. West[299] has shown definitely that it is. Certainly, Propertius may have known it, but that he imitated a rather recent interpolation is not a particularly attractive assumption.

Not even Murgia's case for imitation of the Propertian passage (in Müller's order) by Ovid is decisive. If the couplet is interpolated, as I shall argue below, the interpolator may well have been inspired by Ovid. I still think that the two oldest transpositions are the best: the

---

294 Baehrens also thought the couplet belonged in Cassandra's speech; he put it after 54.

295 Murgia (258f.) rightly rejects attempts to defend the couplet in its transmitted position.

296 *Vertite equum, Danai! male uincitis! Ilia tellus/ uiuet et huic cineri Iuppiter arma dabit.*

297 *uicta tamen uinces euersaque, Troia, resurges:/ obruit hostiles ista ruina domos./ urite uictrices Neptunia Pergama flammae:/ num minus hic toto est altior orbe cinis?*

298 P. 265.

299 See S. West, 'Lycophron Italicised?', *JHS* 104 (1984), 127-151.

obvious place for the verses is either with Marcilius after 68 or with Scaliger after 70.

IV. i. 67-70:
Roma, fave, tibi surgit opus, date candida ciues
omina, et inceptis dextera cantet auis!
sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum:
has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus.

The verses fit in both places. Certainty is hardly attainable. As we shall see in a moment, the couplet is objectionable in itself and probably not genuine. It is hard to be sure about the stylistic competence of the interpolator. Yet Marcilius' suggestion is superior, because line 70 stands better at the end of the speech than between 69 and 87-88, and even the repetition *canam* (87) ... *canam* (69) has some force if the two parallel clauses are placed directly beside each other.[300]

However, if the couplet is accepted as a reference to the poet's design for the present book of elegies, the verses are clearly irrelevant for the following poems, whose contents is fully covered by the announcement of 69.[301] In addition to that, *longa sepulcra* is a strange phrase, certainly more or less intelligible but oddly expressed and most inappropriate in the context.[302] The combination of offences in language, style and contents with the dislocation of the lines should condemn them as interpolated.[303]

The question whether and where to divide IV. i is so hotly discussed that one is reluctant to take too decisive a view, but I venture to support Jachmann's almost forgotten division before 67. 67ff. clearly mark a new start after the sphragis 63f., which aptly concludes a poem.[304] The topic of 67f. has already been touched upon in 57 and would only be an awkward appendix after 61-64, and the address to the *ciues* is inconsistent with that to the *hospes* in line 1. Moreover in the tradition of the *recusatio* the rejection of high poetry is normally preceded by a futile attempt (or at least an intention) of the poet or a request by a patron and does not come unintroduced. One may argue that Horos's mock rejection is a special case, but I still feel that

---

300 Murgia (259) censures the repetition, but even if one dislikes it, it is surely good enough to please an interpolator. Murgia rightly points out that Scaliger's transposition gives a worse result.

301 The inconsistencies of the text have rightly been stressed by Murgia.

302 See Murgia 263f., who resorts to conjecture. Goold (ed.) tries to support Housman's *regna superba* by γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης σκῆπτρα καὶ μοναρχίαν in Lycophron 1229.

303 Cf. also Knoche 1, 51 n. 1.

304 65-66 are suspect.

the speech stands better after an announcement by the poet than if it starts out of the blue.

If 67 starts a poem, the interpolation of 87-88 after the first distich would be of exactly the same type as those discussed above. The interpolated couplet ineptly tries to complete the grand designs foreshadowed by 67-68, by introducing heroic poetry, which plunders the thought of Cassandra's speech in 53-54.

In conclusion we may discuss two further examples where the slight awkwardness in the only position a dislocated couplet can occupy is the main indication of interpolation.

I. vii. 21-26:
tum me non humilem mirabere saepe poetam,
  tunc ego Romanis praeferar ingeniis.
nec poterunt iuuenes nostro reticere sepulcro
  'ardoris nostri magne poeta, iaces'.
tu caue nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu:
  saepe uenit magno faenore tardus Amor.

23f. are not only disruptive between 15-22 and 25f., all addressed to Ponticus; 17ff. speak of what will happen when Ponticus will fall in love,[305] not of events after the poet's death. 23f. clearly belong in the context of 9-14[306] and Housman suggested transposing the lines after 10. Alternatively one may also think of putting the couplet after 14 but in any case the lines still interrupt the neat sequence of thought: 11ff. specify what the poet's *fama* will be and the subjunctives *laudent*, *legat* and *prosint* continue *cupio* in 10. After 14 the lines destroy the juxtaposition of the *neglectus amator* and Ponticus. Moreover the lines fit ill into the sequence of *anaphoras hic* (9)- *haec* (9)—*hinc* (10)/ *me*—*me* (11-13; continued with *te* [15]). Courtney[307] rightly deletes the lines. His deletion is raised beyond doubt by his observation that without the line the two central blocks of poems of book I (vi-ix and x-xiv) are both exactly 140 lines. There is nothing wrong linguistically with 23f. and it is possible that the couplet goes back to a marginal annotation of a line of Propertius (perhaps from the lost portion of book II?) or another elegist,[308] but this is by no means necessary. Whether interpolated consciously or not, in all probability the lines were composed for or written in the margin beside 9-14.

---

[305] *te quoque si certo puer hic concusserit arcu* (15) etc.

[306] *hic mihi conteritur uitae modus, haec mea fama est,/ hinc cupio nomen carminis ire mei./ me laudent doctae solum placuisse puellae,/ Pontice, et iniustas saepe tulisse minas;/ me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator,/ et prosint illi cognita nostra mala.*

[307] See Courtney 1; approved by Goold (ed.) 6ff.

[308] Thus apparently Courtney and Goold.

II. ix. 25-32:
haec mihi uota tuam propter suscepta salutem,
cum capite hoc Stygiae iam poterentur aquae,
et lectum flentes circum staremus amici?
hic ubi tum, pro di, perfida, quisue fuit?
quid si longinquos retinerer miles ad Indos,
aut mea si staret nauis in Oceano?
sed uobis facile est uerba et componere fraudes:
hoc unum didicit femina semper opus.

29-30 seem to me absolutely intolerable in their transmitted position; they cohere neither with the preceding nor with the following verses.[309] The couplet clearly refers to 19-20[310] and only makes sense if placed immediately after 20, as was indeed proposed by Housman (accepted by Goold). That this transposition has received relatively little serious attention is probably due to the fact that even after 20 the couplet sits far from perfectly. It makes good sense after 19-20, but on the other hand 21-22[311] appear to be designed to follow 20 immediately and are certainly less apt after the intrusion of 29-30. Nevertheless, the couplet must be placed after 20; it does not fit too well even there because it is probably interpolated. There are not many objections to 29-30 in style or contents, although the thought of the poet being on military service in India or detained for some reason on a journey in the Indian ocean seems slightly abstruse[312], particularly when it is introduced so abruptly. The colourless and rather unclear *staret* (*navis*) is also suspicious.[313] I think the cumulative evidence of dislocation and the slight awkwardness of the line in various respects tips the balance in favour of deletion.

---

[309] I cannot understand how editors can accept the text without any comment.

[310] *At tu non una potuisti nocte vacare,/ impia, non unum sola manere diem!*

[311] *Quin etiam multo duxisti pocula risu:/ forsitan et de me verba fuere mala.*

[312] One may compare II. xvi. 17-18; there, however, we are dealing with humorous exaggeration (see above p. 37 n. 154).

[313] Enk paraphrases *haeret uadis impedita* referring to Ov. *Met.* iii. 660 ("hold fast" is also Goold's translation); there, however, the meaning is made clear by the context, in particular by the following explanation. That the latter passage is a special case was already seen by A. Palmer in his commentary on the *Heroides* (Oxford 1908) on xvii 208, who is also right on our passage; cf. also Rothstein *ad loc.* ("das Schiff des reisenden Kaufmanns liegt im Hafen").

CHAPTER THREE

SOME REMARKS ON BOOK AND POEM STRUCTURE

There can be hardly any doubt that the relatively short and—as regards damage which goes beyond verbal corruption—relatively well transmitted poems of book I exhibit a clearly discernible substructure made up from more or less self-contained units of normally three to five distichs.[1] Often whole poems are composed entirely from units of equal length and even where this is not the case a rationale of the arrangement is still discernible; we shall discover soon that in some way we are fully justified in applying the term 'stanza composition' to almost all poems of Propertius' first book. In fact, in poems as short as those of the *Monobiblos* (mostly 20-38 lines) such a structural pattern is to some extent the natural effect of the fact that the elegiac couplet is not only a metrical but also a syntactical unit, i.e. major syntactical boundaries almost invariably coincide with the end of a verse and enjambment rarely oversteps the pentameter.[2] Whereas both, stichic metres like the hexameter and even the four line stanzas like Horatius' Odes, are dominated by a skilful interaction between syntactical and metrical structure, the elegiac couplet appears to a considerable degree to lack tensions between syntax and metre. It is thus inevitable that a careful *dispositio* in elegiac metre will produce a somehow regular pattern of units consisting of several entire distichs; and in any case, numerical proportions between substructures are inevitably felt more strongly in shorter textual units; to build longer compositions on numerical proportions between small sections would be boring and pedantic, and strict numerical proportions between longer passages, as we shall indeed find in Propertius' work[3], are more or less playful. But in relatively small compositions any attempt

---

[1] See Goold (ed.) 23f.; in his Loeb edition Goold indicates the structure in print; useful indications and discussion of structural patterns are also found in the commentaries of Camps, Fedeli and Giardina; see also Boucher 366ff. and Lefèvre 152f. on book III; cf. also H. Belling, 'De Properti Vergilique libros componentium artificiis', in: *Festschrift J. Vahlen* (Berlin 1900) 269-282.

[2] Cf. F. Crusius, *Römische Metrik* (²München 1955), 59; M. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse* (Cambridge 1951), 27ff.; E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* I (Rome 1964), 74ff.

[3] See below p. 153f.

to built a careful balance into a sharply marked structure will almost inevitably result in some kind of numerical pattern.[4]

The subdivisions of the text on which scholars have based their number patterns have regularly been derided as purely arbitrary, and of course the subdivision of a text must always be subjective to a certain extent. Yet even that it should be merely possible to subdivide a text regularly without bias so that simple numerical proportions between various sections arise must be perplexing had the author not worked with a numerical pattern in mind. Moreover, I think we often can put flesh to subdivisions made on grounds of content by the observation of the formal means of marking substructures.

In the relatively small compass of the short poems of Propertius' first book every unit of three to five distichs may at the same time simply represent the smallest self-contained unit of thought. Yet Propertius stresses the structural pattern by formal means clearly marking off most of his 'stanzas' from what follows or precedes and giving every stanza a distinct formal unity of its own. A particularly clear example of his stanza technique is I. vi. The structure of the poem has been discussed by several scholars in the past[5] and we shall

[4] "Gewiß ist es zweifellos, daß im großen wie im einzelnen oft eine gewisse Symmetrie sich zeigen wird; die beobachten auch wir in Prosadarstellungen; daß der Dichter, sobald er rhetorisch wird, eine Art von Gleichmäßigkeit in der Rede sucht, ist erst recht verständlich. Und auch im großen wird eine entsprechende Harmonie der Teile herzustellen sich ihm manchmal von selber ergeben haben, wenn er eine richtige Abwechselung zu schaffen sich bemühte", thus even R. Helm (*Bursians Jahresbericht* 113 [1902] 40ff.) in his devastating review of Belling's work on Vergil (H. Belling, *Studien über die Kompositionskunst Vergils in der Aeneis* (Leipzig 1899; id. in: *Festschrift Vahlen* [n. 1] 283ff.). For number patterns in prose composition see the admirable paper of E. Rawson in: *Papers of the British School at Rome* 46 (1978) 12-34 (= *Roman Culture and Society* [Oxford 1991] 324-351. For examples from another genre one may compare e.g. Horace's Epistels where many of the shorter poems, in contrast to longer compositions, correspond to a simple numerical pattern: I. iv = 5 + 6 + 5, v = 11 + 9 + 11, xi = 10 + 9 + 11, xx = 8 + 10 + 10. Even a poem of moderate length like I. xiv is divided into 14 + 16 + 14; cf. also the only satire which is decidedly shorter than the rest, I. vii = 8 + 19 + 8. For numerical patterns and symmetrical structure in other poets see—beside the studies cited by Goold (ed.) 8—Skutsch's similar study on the *Bucolica* in 'Symmetry and Sense in the *Eclogues*', *HSCP* 73 (1969) 153-169 and J. Van Sickles review of the topic in *Enc. Virg.* I 549ff.; F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (Cambridge 1979), 196ff.; cf. also the interesting recent hypotheses on Theocritus advanced by J. Irigoin, 'Les Bucoliques de Théocrite. La composition du recueil', *QUCC* 19 (1975), 27-44; G. Ancher, 'Les *Bucoliques* de Théocrite: structure et composition du recueil', *REG* 94 (1981), 295-314 and C. Meillier, 'Quelques nouvelles perspectives dans l'étude de Théocrite', *ibid.* 315-337. However, despite its attractions the criticism of G. Serrao (*Enc. Virg.* V 112f.) is valid. On symmetrical composition in Homer cf. the literature cited in the most useful summary of research on the structure of the Homeric poems by M. Reichel, *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias* (*Script-Oralia* 62, Tübingen 1994) 22f.

see that attention to the formal means of marking subdivisions will provide more objective criteria for a structural analysis.

A **Non ego** nunc Hadriae uereor mare nosc**ere** tecum,
Tulle, **neque** Aegaeo duc**ere** uela salo,
cum quo Rhipaeos possim conscend**ere** montis
ulteriusque domos uad**ere** Memnonias;
sed me complexae remorantur uerba puellae,
mutatoque graues saepe colore preces.

B **illa mihi** totis argutat noctibus ignis,
et queritur nullos esse relicta deos;
illa †meam† **mihi** iam se denegat[6], **illa** minatur
quae solet ingrato tristis amica uiro.
his ego non horam possum durare querelis:
ah pereat, si quis lentus amare potest!

C **an mihi** sit tanti doctas cognosc**ere** Athenas
atque Asiae ueteres cern**ere** diuitias,
ut **mihi** deducta faciat conuicia puppi
Cynthia et insanis ora notet manibus,
osculaque opposito dicat sibi debita uento,
et nihil infido durius esse uiro?

D **tu** patrui meritas conare anteire securis,
et uetera oblitis iura refer sociis.
nam **tua non** aetas umquam cessauit amori,
semper at armatae cura fuit patriae;
et **tibi non** umquam nostros puer iste labores
afferat et lacrimis omnia nota meis!

E **me** sine, quem semper uoluit fortuna iac**ere**,
huic animam extremam redd**ere** nequitiae.[7]
multi longinquo periere in amore libenter,
in quorum numero **me** quoque terra tegat.
non ego sum laudi, **non** natus idoneus armis:
hanc me militiam fata subire uolunt.

F **at tu**, **seu** mollis qua tendit Ionia, **seu** qua
Lydia Pactoli tingit arata liquor,
seu pedibus terras **seu** pontum remige carpes,[8]
ibis et accepti pars eris imperii:
tum tibi si qua mei ueniet non immemor hora,
uiuere me duro sidere certus eris.

---

[5] See Fedeli *ad loc.*, who conveniently reports the previous research; there is in fact hardly any difference between the various divisions proposed.

[6] See above p. 96f.

[7] huic ... extremam *Housman* : hanc ... -ae *codd.*

[8] remige carpes *Skutsch* : carpere remis *codd.*

Every stanza of six lines shows not only a neat thematic unity but is clearly set off as a formal unit as well, and I have printed above the main structural indicators in bold type. Stanzas B-D and F are hold together either by a parallel colon structure, in most cases clearly marked by *anaphora* and *epanalepsis*[9]; in addition B and F are closed by a rounding off couplet, introduced by a resumptive particle or pronoun.[10] A and E each present one neat antithetically expressed unit of thought.[11] The six stanzas are marked off from each other either by change of syntax (B and D end in an exclamation[12], C is a question[13]) or, most conspicuously, by a marked change of the person on which the focus of thought rests, a change again underpinned by *anaphora* or *epanalepsis* and, if not explicitly, at least implicitly antithetical (A: *ego* ... *me*; B: *illa* ... *illa* ... *illa*; C: *mihi* ... *mihi*; D: *tu* ... *tua* ... *tibi*; E: *me* ... *mihi*; F: *at tu* ... *tibi*).[14] This technique with its stress on antithesis, parallel cola and rounding off *sententiae* reveals rhetorical theory and indeed the influence of rhetoric is pervasive in book I where many poems show a sharp argumentative structure which distinctly echoes declamatory practice.[15] In book I the tidily marked stanza pattern simply reflects the carefully contrived argumentative structure of these poems and it is not chance that poems of a very simple stanza type come back in the later parts of book III where we encounter again the influence of the declamation of the school.[16] On closer inspection Propertius' technique in book I is quite obtrusively rhetoric; what is so remarkable about these poems is that nevertheless they possess a directness and charm which is completely Propertius' own and defies any attempt of explanation.

One further example may suffice to illustrate Propertius' stanza

---

[9] For this device cf. e.g. I. iv. 17-22, 23-28; iv. 7-12, 13-18, 19-24, viii. 1-10, xiii. 19-22.

[10] Cf. e.g. I. ix. 23f., xiv. 7f., 15f., xix. 5f.

[11] Cf. e.g. I. iv. 5-10, xiv. 1-8.

[12] Cf. e.g. I. v. 13-18, viii. 1-8 (questions), 9-16 (exclamations), 17-20 (affirmation), ix. 1-8.

[13] Cf. e.g. I. iv. 1-4, ix. 9-14 (starting with a question ending with exclamations), xi. 1-8, 15f., xii. 1-10.

[14] Cf. v 13, vi. 7, (13 *mihi*), vii. 15 (*te* etc.)

[15] "All writers of Latin prose and verse from the Augustan age to the end of antiquity had their secondary education in schools that taught declamation; and even the greatest of them could not keep—did not wish to keep—their style unmarked by the experience", M. Winterbottom in the preface (p. xxiii) to his Loeb text (Cambridge Mass. 1974) of Seneca's *Controuersiae*.

[16] See below p. 151.

technique, and we may select a poem where even the topic is demonstrably borrowed from rhetoric: I. ii[17]:

A **Quid** iuuat ornato proced**ere**, uita, capillo
   et tenuis Coa ueste mou**ere** sinus,
aut quid Orontea crinis perfundere murra,
   te**que** peregrinis uend**ere** muneribus,
naturae**que** decus mercato perd**ere** cultu,
   nec sin**ere** in propriis membra nitere bonis?
crede mihi, **non** ulla tuae est medicina figurae:
   nudus Amor formae **non** amat artificem.[18]

B **aspice quos summittat** humus †formosa† colores[19],
   ut ueniant hederae sponte sua melius,
surgat et in solis formosior arbutus antris,
   et sciat indocilis currere lympha uias.
litora natiuis †**persuadent**† picta lapillis,
   et uolucres nulla dulcius arte **canunt**.

C **non sic** Leucippis succendit Castora Phoebe,
   Pollucem cultu **non** Helaira soror;
non, Idae et cupido quondam discordia Phoebo,
   Eueni patriis filia litoribus;
nec Phrygium falso traxit candore maritum
   auecta externis Hippodamia rotis:
sed facies aderat nullis obnoxia gemmis,
   qualis Apelleis est color in tabulis.
non illis studium fuco[20] conquirere amantis:
   illis ampla satis forma pudicitia.

D **non ego nunc** uereor ne **sis tibi** uilior istis:
   uni si qua placet, culta puella sat est;
cum **tibi** praesertim Phoebus sua carmina donet
   Aoniamque libens Calliopea lyram,
unica nec desit iucundis gratia uerbis,
   omnia quaeque Venus, quaeque Minerua probat.
his tu semper **eris** nostrae gratissima uitae,
   taedia dum miserae sint tibi luxuriae.

---

[17] For similar motifs in comedy, epigram and epistolography cf. the discussion in Fedeli's and Enk's commentary and A.A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love Elegy* (Oxford 1938), 40ff. with references to the previous research. Day (59) has rightly pointed out that the remarkable spread of similar motifs in comedy, epigram, epistolography and Roman elegy, which led Leo to the assumption of an alexandrine archetype of Roman love elegy, is in fact due to the pervasive influence of rhetoric declamation which is, of course, profoundly influenced by stereotypes borrowed from Menander and New Comedy. This appears to me particularly true for I. ii; cf. Fedeli's excellent introduction to the poem (pp. 88ff.).

[18] On the text see above p. 108 n. 199.

[19] See above p. 110.

[20] fuco *Eldik* : uulgo *codd.*

In this case the thematic unity of the four stanzas is particularly strong and obvious but in addition the poem shows the same formal elements in marking stanza unity as vi: parallel cola (in ABC), antithesis (in C) and rounding off distichs (in ACD); stanzas are separated by different syntax (question in A; imperative begins B) and antithesis (C against B).

This poem is distinguished from vi by the fact that the stanza length is varied from six to ten lines; between two stanzas of eight lines each (A and D) we find a centre of sixteen (= 2 x 8) lines: two interlaced sections are 'dovetailed'[21] so as to create a division 6 : 10. This way of varying the uniform stanza structure can be observed elsewhere in book I. In fact, if we allow for extended initial or rounding off sections[22] and interlaced structures of the type found in I. ii, among the twenty poems of book I relevant for our purpose[23] all but six can easily be analysed according to a clear-cut strophic pattern of stanzas of 6 to 10 lines[24]. Except for two special cases which fall outside the normal pattern[25] we shall always find variations like 8 : 12, 6 : 10, 4 : 8; in all but one difficult case[26] such stanzas are found in company of at least one stanza of intermediate length. In book I normally we do not encounter poems composed entirely of varying stanzas of say 8 and 10 or 6 and 8 lines.[27]

With the transmitted text apparent exceptions to this rule are: i, iv, vii, xv, xvi, xx. Of these we can exclude right away xx: this is a special case in form and, as regards the first book, also in length. There the narrative is set into the frame of the surrounding address to Gallus; thus the poem shares a framing structure with xvi, the second longest poem of the book, at least in its transmitted form. Poems featuring a frame surrounding a longer central speech like I. xvi we shall find again prominently in book IV; and as regards I. xx one may compare

---

21 I borrow this term from metre; see P. Maas, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1962), p. 44 ('dovetailing' translating the German 'Verzahnung').

22 In these poems normally the last stanza is extended by a rounding off couplet similar to those sometimes seen in the middle of the poem (see above). A special case is I. iii, the only narrative poem of the erotic poems proper, here the last section (31-46) featuring Cynthia's speech counts three distichs more than the preceding 10 line stanzas.

23 This is all but the two final epigrams xxi and xxii of only 10 lines each.

24 Six poems in completely uniform stanzas: vi (6 x 10), viii B (2 x 10), x (3 x 10), xii (2 x 10), xiv (3 x 8), xviii (4 x 8); one with extended stanza at the beginning: viii A (8 + 3 x 6); four with extended rounding off section: iii (3 x 10 + 6), ix (4 x 8 + 2), xvii (2 x 12 + 4), xix (4 x 6 + 2); three with dovetailing: ii (8 + 6 + 10), xi (8 + 12 + 10), xiii (4 + 8 + 2 x 6 + 4 + 8); for iv/ v see below.

25 I. xvi and xx; see below.

26 I. i, see below p. 139f.

27 I. xvi and xx (see below) are different; they are not strictly strophic.

IV. vi where not only the central speech of Apollo is framed by a narrative section, but the narrative itself is similarly framed to that of I. xx. This is, of course, a device derived directly from Hellenistic poetry, and conform to Hellenistic models the framing sections are normally (i.e. in all but one case[28]) asymmetric.

Allowing for an asymmetric frame in the two framed poems of Propertius' book I, the narrative section of the Hylas epyllion (framed by 14 : 2 lines) still shows a neat strophic pattern with two different stanzas alternating: 10 + 8 + 10 + 8 lines. In xvi a strophic pattern of perfectly equal stanzas has been attained by Goold who accepts Richmond's transposition of 25f. after 36. However, the lines do not present a problem in their transmitted place and Goold's analysis seems unsatisfactory to me anyhow as regards the last stanza. The conclusion of the speech of the excluded lover cannot be mixed up with the concluding distichs and 41-44 belong closely together with 35ff. If we allow for an asymmetric frame of 16 : 4 (or, if one accepts Lachmann's deletion of 13f.[29], of 14 : 4) the lover's speech (in the transmitted order of lines) falls into 10 + 8 + 10 distichs.[30] Excluding xvi and xx the remaining poems which in their transmitted form do not fit the pattern described are only four out of twenty.

vii presents no problem if Courtney's deletion of 23f.[31] is accepted; then the poem can be analysed as 8 + 6 + 10 lines (interlaced type). Similarly the structure of xv is rendered perfectly rational by the deletion of 15f.[32]: 8 + 12 + 10 + 10 lines. The case of iv is slightly more complicated. The transposition of v. 1f. after iv. 4 proposed above[33] certainly removes any problem in iv (5 x 6 lines), now however v lacks one distich at the beginning: from 7 onward the poem is composed of regular stanzas of 6 lines (like its brother iv!) with a rounding off couplet 31f. at the end. If, in analogy with the concluding stanza, we accept an additional distich for the first stanza in viiiA we may perhaps also accept an initial stanza cut short by one couplet, alternatively we could consider the loss of a couplet at the beginning of the poem. As regards the last case, I. i[34], a lacuna has been sus-

---

[28] See below p. 153.

[29] See above p. 121f.

[30] 17-26 and 35-44 address the *ianua*, 27-34 speak of the girl inside (*illa*); 17-26 start with a series of questions; 27-34 start, 35-44 end with an exclamation; note also *anaphora* and *epanalepsis* in 27-34 and 35-44.

[31] See above p. 131.

[32] Above p. 123f.

[33] Above p. 48.

[34] The strophic analysis proposed by B. Otis ('Propertius' Single Book', *HSCP* 70 [1965], 10) on the basis of the transmitted number of lines has rightly been rejected by Fedeli (*ad loc.*).

pected in this poem for reasons wholly unconnected with structural considerations. With Housman's lacuna of two lines after 12 the poem could be analysed as 8 + 12 + 12 + 8.[35] On the other hand, Housman's lacuna after 12 can be dispensed with by reading the humanist conjecture *saepe* in 12.[36]

Moreover, as I have already said above[37], before we assume lacunae or interpolations in book I one great precaution must be made. The numerical pattern of the book structure demonstrated by Courtney and Skutsch[38] would seem to justify only one deletion, that of vii. 23f. It would indeed be very odd if the symmetry of 176 lines each for the framing sections i-v and xv-xix should have arisen by chance in a text grossly disfigured by lacunae and interpolation.[39] On the other hand, for various reasons I cannot feel satisfied with the transmitted text in a number of places, and it would of course be perfectly rational if in a pattern $A^1B^1B^2A^2C$, as demonstrated by Skutsch for the *Monobiblos*,[40] only the central section B^1B^2 should be in perfect symmetry whereas in the framing sections A^1 could be slightly longer than A^2 standing beside the appendix C. One may also point out that accepting the deletions of xv. 15f. and xvi. 11f. (in addition of course to Courtney's deletion of vii. 23f.) and the lacunae after i. 12 and before v. 3 Courtney's equation $A^1 + A^2 = B^1 + B^2 + C$ could still stand: 180 + 172 = 140 + 140 + 72. Yet with a text as hypothetical as one with two lacunae and three deletions involved such a calculation must seem rather futile; to renounce a perfectly symmetrical pattern of the transmission for a less convincing hypothetical one is unacceptable. Though I am unwilling to brush aside the existing difficulties I feel highly uncertain of any of the solutions I have proposed above and prefer to accept no deletions or lacunae in book I save Courtney's excision of vii. 23f.; perhaps we must admit that some compositions in book I depart from the normal stanza pattern.[41]

---

[35] Similarly already P. J. Enk, 'Lucubrationes Propertianae', *Mnemosyne* III 3 (1936), 149f. and Boucher 367 n. 1.

[36] See above p. 110.

[37] P. 122.

[38] See Courtney 1, following Skutsch 1.

[39] As regards Housman's lacuna in I. i one may also remember that III. xxiv/xxv, clearly referring to the former elegy, consist of 38 lines as I. i in its transmitted form (pointed out by Goold [ed.] p. 347 n. b).

[40] See Skutsch 1.

[41] The structure of I. i may be deliberatly assymertical; I have treated the structural problems in I. i and III. xxiv/xxv, which deliberately echoes the line number and the structural pattern of I. i, in my forthcoming paper *Properz und das Selbstzitat in der augusteischen Dichtung* (to appear shortly in *SBAW*).

If we turn to book II and look at the comparatively little destroyed poems of small or moderate length we still find many which display a structure very similar to those of book I.[42] However, the first observation one makes is that except for the perfectly symmetrical epigram II. xii (= 12 + 12) we hardly encounter any poems composed exclusively from identical units. In the first part of book II (i.e. the original book II) we still find three poems made up of identical units save the last which is either cut short or extended; cf. II. v = 8 + 8 + 14; vii = 8 + 8 + 6; x = 6 + 6 + 6 + 8. In the second half, i.e. in the original book III we always find poems made up alternatively from two different units: cf. xix = 6 + 10 + 10 + 6; xx = 8 + 10 + 10 + 8; xxi = 6 + 8 + 6; xxv = 10 + 10 + 8 + 10 + 10; xxvi = 6 + 4 + 6 + 4; xxvii = 4 + 6 + 6; xxixB = 8 + 8 + 4. Now alternating stanzas of 8 and 10, 6 and 8 and 4 and 6 lines are regular. Yet dovetailing is still found in xix and one may compare also xiv (= 10 + 8 + 12) or xxvi B (8 + 8 [lacuna, 29-34] + 10 + 6 + 8),[43] xxxB (= 6 + 10 + 8), xxxiiiB (= 4 + 8 + 6) and perhaps xxivB which I would divide into 8 (17-22, 47f.[44]: Cynthia's infidelity) + 10 (the rival) + 6 (Cynthia discovering the poet's fidelity too late) + 8 lines (Propertius fidelity opposed to fickle lover's of myth) with an appendix of two rounding off couplets (49-52).[45]

The structure of II. xv has been much discussed in the past, mainly in response to Jachmann's assumption of major interpolation. If one rejects Jachmann's views one may accept Goold's analysis[46]

---

[42] As already in book I the subdivisions of poems I shall propose for poems in books II - IV are as a rule in accord with those printed by Goold, only that, especially in larger poems, I sometimes assume fewer divisions, limiting myself to the larger divisions which seem to me beyond dispute. I trust that most of the subdivisions where I find myself in agreement with Goold and others (for book II cf. especially Giardina's commentary) need not be argued further. Thus I only discuss subdivisions when my analysis differs from Goold's or rests on a different text; I may however occasionally illustrate my structural analysis by subtitles.

[43] For the lacuna after 28 see above p. 82f.

[44] For Rossberg's transposition of 47f. see above p. 49f.

[45] The poem starts with three distichs, each comprising a neat antithesis rounded off by a *sententia* (A). B focuses on the rival, in C the focus shifts to Propertius and Cynthia; the section is marked off by direct speech. In D the focus shifts back from the second person predicates in C to the first person; in the appendix the focus rests again on Cynthia (*noli* ... *tibi* ... *tu*). The shift from one person to the other is always introduced by *anaphora* or *epanalepsis* (*contendat* ... *contendat* [23]; *at me non* ... *non* ... *non* [33f.] ... *tua* ... *tu* ... *certus eras, certus eras* [36f.]; *non* ... *numquam* ... *nullum* ... *credo ego non* ... *credo ego* ... *non* [39ff.]; *noli* ... *noli* [49]).

[46] I must however say that I fail to understand the wholly fantastic analysis given by F. Stoessl ('Die Kußgedichte des Catull und ihre Nachwirkung', *WS* 63 [1948], 108-116) in defence of the transmitted text, although it even found its way into Enk's commentary. There is not the shadow of a break between 6 and 7 or 30 and 31 as Stoessl assumes.

which makes the poem into 10 + 14 + 12 + 12 with a rounding off section of three couplets (49-54). I think however that strong suspicion must fall upon 25-28 and 39f.; if these lines are deleted we get 10 + 14 + 10 (29-38) + 14 (41-54). However this may be, the variation between two stanzas of different length seen in book II is a natural development of the interlaced type and could already be observed in the two abnormal poems of book I, xvi and xx.

In book II we find also two relatively short poems without any clearly discernible subdivision like xxixA and xxxiiiA (both 22 lines).[47] Where stanza composition is employed we still encounter similar devices of marking stanza unity as in book I: parallel structure and change of focus marked by *anaphora* and *epanadiplosis*, rounding off distichs. However, it is quite obvious that in book II the structure is on the whole much less obtrusively marked than in book I; the single stanzas are much less compact and the poet clearly aims much more at variation in the compass of every stanza; sometimes the unity of the stanza may be purely thematic.[48]

Already in the poems discussed so far we have occasionally found units larger than the normal 6 to 10 distichs; in book II we find also several poems which are built of rather larger units, namely there are two elegies which fall into two equal halves; cf. II. iii = 22 + 22 (the poet enslaved again/ Cynthia's qualities); xxiii = 24 + 24 (the inconveniences of courting respectable ladies/ the advantages of courtesans). Equally viii and ixA (i.e. vv. 1-40) are most conveniently divided into two blocks of equal length: in viii the personal part and the mythical examples count each 20 lines; ix is made up from 2 x 16 verses (2-18; 19-28, 31-36[49]: examples of wifely fidelity from myth/ Cynthia's infidelity) preceded by one distich stating the theme of the poem and followed by two rounding off couplets (37-40).

---

[47] Contrast however II. xxvi A, xxix B and xxxiii B all narrative like xxixA and yet clearly in stanza form.

[48] Cf. in the first half of the book II. v: A (1 - 8): *hoc* ... *haec*; B (9-16): *non ita* ... *nec* ... *nec*; C (17-30): *non solum* ... *nec* ... *nec* ... *nec* ... *nec*; A is rounded off by an exclamation, C starts with one (*at tu*); B is rounded off by a *sententia*; in x: A (1-6): *tempus lustrare* ... *libet* ... *memorare* ... *et* ... *dicere*; B (7-12): *nunc* ... *nunc* ... *nunc*; D (19-26): *haec* ... *castra* ... *castra* ... *hunc* ... *his*; A is rounded off by a *sententia*, B and C by an exclamation. In the original book III cf. e.g. II. xix: A (1-6): *nullus erit*... *nulla* ... *orietur* ... *nec* ... *erit*; B (7-16): *sola eris*... *solos spectabis*... *illic* ... *illic* ... *spectabis* ... *ibi* ... *feres* ... *imitabere*; C (17-26): *ipse ego* ... *me* ... *incipiam* ... *mihi*; D (27-32): *tu* ... *memento*. Although all features of stanza unity known from book I are there, the syntax is skilfully varied: the *anaphora illic* is taken up by *ibi* and the series of second person verbs in B is interrupted by a third person in 9f.; C and D are not composed in parallel periods. For an example where the unity of the stanzas is purely thematic see below II. xxviii.

[49] On 29f. see above p. 132.

Among the highly destroyed poems of book II discussed above it would be futile to look for a structural pattern for such heavily lacunose poems as II. ii, iiiB, iv, ixB, xi, xviiiABCD, xxivA, xxxA. Among those in which I have suggested larger transpositions II. viA and xxviiiA fit very beautifully into a stanza pattern: viA = 8 + 8 + 8 + 10,[50] absolutely parallel to the structure of the other stanza poems of the original book II in close vicinity.

xxviiiA is in my arrangement perfectly symmetrical (8 + 8 + 12 + 8 + 8); except for the series of mythical *exempla* in 15ff. the single stanzas show no formal unity but aim at variation (especially the long middle section). However the thematic unity of every stanza is very strong: A (1f., 33-38): Cynthia's desperate state of health; B (39-46): the lovers' vow; C (3-14): the reasons of Cynthia's illness; D (15-24): deified beauties of myth; E (25-32): Cynthia's fate after death.

Housman's combination of II. xvii and xxiiB together with my deletion of II. xvii. 13f. creates two perfectly symmetrical halves of 24 lines (xvii. 1-4, xxiiB + xvii. 5-12, 15-18) which need no further comment. My arrangement of II. xviA would produce three units of seven distichs (A = 1-12, 17f.; B = 15f., 19-26, 13f., 27f., C = 29f., 43-54) concluded by a rounding off couplet: This is almost unique as regards the stanza length—one may perhaps compare the immediately preceding poem xv—,[51] but in spite of the great length of the stanza and attempts at lively variation we can still recognise many features of Propertian stanza composition; in particular the *anaphora* uniting the main body of the middle section (*numquam* ... *numquam* ... *non*), the start with a question (15) and the end with two exclamations (13f., 29f.) of B, the focus on Cynthia in 1-12 (A), 17f. and in 29f., 43-56 (C) contrasting with the general reflections in 15ff. (B).

II. xxxi/ xxxii is in my arrangement a most remarkable example of pure stanza composition in one of the longest poems in the book (the preserved text alone counts 78 lines); if we accept a lacuna after 30 the text before the final lacuna can be neatly divided into stanzas of 8 lines with some dovetailing (8 + 8 + 10 + 6 + 8 + 6 + 10 + 8 + 6 + 10 ...): A = xxxi. 1-8 (the porticus); B = xxxi. 9-16 (the temple); C = xxxii. 7-10, 1-6 (Cynthia's excursions); D = xxxii. 11-16 (Pompey's portico); E = xxxii. 17-24 (Cynthia's behaviour and its consequences); F = xxxii. 25-30 (Cynthia indifferent against accusations); G = la-

[50] *Non ita* ... *nec* ... *tanta* ... *nec* ... *tam* (1-6); *me* ... *me* etc. (8-14); *his* ... *his* ... *tu* ... *tu*... *per te* (15-22); *quid* ... *quos* ... *quae* ...? (23-40; starts with exclamation).

[51] See above p. 141f.

cuna[52], 41-48 (lax morals in contemporary Rome); H = 49-56 (mortal and divine women equally unfaithful); I = 57-60, 31-32 (examples of unfaithful mortals); J = 33-40, lacuna (Venus' infidelity)...[53] The first speech of the poet (xxxi [= 16 lines] and xxxii. 7-10, 1-6, 11-24) appears to comprise exactly the same number of lines (40) as Cynthia's response (xxxii. 25-30, 41-60, 31-40).

As regards II. vi and xvi a structural analysis does not only confirm the arrangement proposed by me, attention to a rational structural pattern must also cast some doubt on the transmitted text. vi. 27-34 and xvi. 31-42 each constitute a closely knit passage which does not fit in any way into a rational pattern and xxxii too in its transmitted form does not exhibit a convincing structure.

II. xxxi/ xxxii has already led us to the four poems of book II which are incomparably longer than anything in book I. The other three do not show the plain stanza pattern of xxxi/ xxxii (in my reconstruction) but in spite of their great length and despite the fact that all these poems have been divided in the past by many critics II. i, xiii and xxxiv show, on closer inspection, a remarkably neat and carefully balanced structure. II. i falls into two large unequal halves 1-46 (the poet's task) and 47-78 (the lover's life and death), i.e. with the indispensable lacuna after 38 into 48 + 32 lines. The first half is divided into 16 + 32 (the poet's themes/ futile attempts at martial topics) the second into 24 + 8 (a life dominated by love/ death and eternal fame). This means the poem, counting 80 lines, is skilfully divided into asymmetrical sections all made up from different multiples of 8 (2 x 8 + 4 x 8 + 3 x 8 + 1 x 8). This remarkable subdivision can hardly have arisen by chance and shows beyond reasonable doubt that Propertius worked with a numerical pattern in mind.

II. xiii again shows a main division into two heavily asymmetrical halves 16 + 42 (the erotic poet and his inspiration/ a poet's funeral and death); however, the second half can be divided into 26 + 16 (the funeral proceedings/ may I die soon). Thus the asymmetrical two part structure is countered by a perfectly symmetrical threefold structure: 16 + 26 + 16. If in xxxiv we accept my suggestion to place a lacuna of one distich after 40[54] we arrive—as in II. i—at a twofold structure where both halves are composed from multiples of 8 lines:

---

[52] Since the text is lost we cannot be sure where the division falls, but because the couplet will have introduced us to the situation in contemporary Rome I have preferred to give it to the following rather than to the preceding section.

[53] C and E start with exclamation, C and H end with questions; cf. also *quid* ... *cur* ... *cur* (3ff.); *et platanis* ... *surgentibus* ... *et* ... *lymphis* ... *crepitantibus* (13ff.); *falleris* ... *non* ... *fugis nil agis* ... *componis* ... *tendis* ... *sed* (17ff.); *sed tu non* ... *non* ... *sin autem* ... *non* (25ff.); *haec* ... *quae* ... *qui* ... *hic* (45ff.); *tu* ... *poteris* ... *at* ... *dic* (49ff.); *quamuis* ... *quamuis* (33ff.).

[54] See above p. 84f.

24 (Lynceus and Cynthia) + 72 (on love poetry). The first half falls into two unequal parts of multiples of 8: 8 + 16 (love and friendship/ Lynceus' crime). The second longer half is divided perfectly symmetrically into 36 + 36 (Lynceus must turn to love poetry/ in praise of love poetry).[55]

Unfortunately book II is too heavily fragmented to allow much insight into the book structure. It is however clear that both books now united in book II featured dramatically arranged elegy cycles which, in a way, cohere even more closely than these in book I.[56] It is also conspicuous that in the cases where the poem structure is discernible for a series of consecutive poems often poems of a similar structure are united: II. v-vii (= 4 + 4 + 7/ 4 + 4 + 4 + 5/ 4 + 4 + 3); then two poems in two halves about the rival viii and ixA[57]. The pair xix/ xx shows a parallel symmetrical structure (6 + 10 + 10 + 6/ 8 + 10 + 10 + 8) which is echoed in the short following poem xxi (6 + 8 + 6) leading on to the following Demophoon cycle. For the two first poems of this cycle (xxiiA, xxiii) the structure is perceivable: they are divided in two halves (18 + 20, 12 + 12). On the other hand the original book III begins with a series of five poems of quite different, partly very elaborate structure. The large symmetrical poem xxviiiA is framed by two short poems (xxvii/ xxviii B) of exactly the same length (16 lines).

A further development of Propertius' art of composition can be observed in book III. Here it will be useful to consider the book structure first.[58] Matters are complicated because, on my hypothesis, the book has suffered major text losses in at least one, probably two

[55] If my reconstruction of xxxi/ xxxii is correct the three longest poems of book II, i.e. i, xxxi/xxxii and xxxiv (xiii is with 58 lines not markedly longer than several other compositions), present a comprehensive number of lines divisible by 8.

[56] The little which remains from the original book II suggests that it may have comprised a linear development from harmony (i - iii B) to estrangement (iv-vi) and final separation (viii - ix), a development apparently interrupted by vii which is however—despite the first distich—only a declaration of the poet's devotion and does not reflect on Cynthia's attitude towards her lover. The original book III appears, as far as one can still judge, to have featured a series of closely knit smaller cycles of two or three poems, often dramatic pairs (xiv/ xv; ?xviA/B; xix/ xx; xxii - xxivA; xxivB/ xxv; xxviA/B; xxviii A/B; xxixA/B); the connection between the cycles may again be pseudo-dramatic: xiv/ xv - xviA/B etc.: happiness destroyed; ?xviii - xix/ xx: harmony restored; as regards xxi - xxii/ xxiii/ xxivA - xxivB/ xxv see above p. 121. Or a connection may be supplied by a common motif (death in xxvi A/B - xxvii - xxviiiA/B). From xxx onward the poems appears to lack any close connection; presumably Propertius located towards the end of the book the poems which he found difficult to fit into the thematic development of the book.

[57] See above p. 15f.

[58] A convenient survey of previous research on the structure of book III can be found in the introduction of Fedeli's commentary (pp. 29ff.).

places; nevertheless a numerical pattern of the book composition can still be discovered.[59] Although in book III the erotic theme still heavily prevails the thematic connection between the poems is much looser than in books I and II; in particular, the pseudo-dramatic structure which so neatly holds together the poems of books I and II has gone. Moreover non-erotic poems are not any longer, as in books I and II, confined to the beginning or the end of the book but had to be accommodated in the main body of the text. Thus after the introductory poems book III appears to present a series of loosely connected erotic poems, here and there interspersed with poems of different contents, namely vii, xi, xvii, xviii and xxii. As we shall see Propertius did his best to arrange the poems in a meaningful way despite the obvious lack of thematic unity, but moreover he tried to counter the lack of thematic cohesion by an elaborate numerical pattern for the whole book in which the structure of single poems and that of the larger whole interact in a highly sophisticated way.

It may be useful to present first my scheme for the whole book before I discuss the details, but because the scheme presupposes a number of textual operations I have to remind the reader first that—except for two possible deletions of interpolation in lacunae which do not affect the line number (ix. 35 and xi. 58, 67f.)[60]—I accept the following five deletions in book III: ii. 1f. (del. Knoche; 'Schlußinterpolation'), xiv. 17-20 (del. Knoche) with a lacuna after 16, xv. 45f. (see above p. ooo), xxi. 25f. (del. Lachmann and others), xxii. 37f. (del. Knoche). The deletions of xv. 45f. and xxii. 37f. have already been discussed above[61] and that of III. ii. 1f. and xxi. 25f. have been argued by Knoche.[62] xiv. 17-20 present the most compli-

---

[59] The lack of corroboration by numerical symmetries for the many structural patterns proposed on thematic grounds for book III has justly been pointed out by E. Courtney, 'The Structure of Propertius Book 3', *Phoenix* 24 (1970), 49-53.

[60] See above pp. 73ff.

[61] See p. 123, 128f.

[62] See Knoche 1, 49; as regards ii. 1f. the couplet fits ill at the beginning of ii; the mythical *exempla* in 3ff. mark a fresh start leading to the general conclusion of 9f. (about the *turba puellarum* not the poet's *puella*!). However, as the conclusion of i the couplet would be a most awkward appendix after the poem has ended with the proud claim of 35-38. For xxi. 25f. see Shackleton Bailey 2, 208f. who, for all his defence of the couplet, admits that the lines "present enough of real difficulty to justify some misgiving". One could argue that the deletion destroys the symmetrical structure of the poem pointed out by F. Jacoby ('Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie', *RhM* 60 [1905], 90f. n.2), Richardson and Fedeli *ad loc.*, who would divide the poem into 4 + 6 + 14 + 6 + 4 lines. On the contrary, the deletion of 25f. results in the structure 10 + 12 (11-22) + 10 (23f., 26-34). The break between the middle and the concluding section falls between 22 and 23: 11-22 describe the journey (beginning and ending with an imperative!), 23ff. arrival and stay in Athens. For the structure of the poem see also below p. 151.

cated case, but Knoche, in my opinion, was right to expel the lines (inspired by Stat. *Silv.* IV. viii. 28).[63] However, there still remains the problem of vv. 15f. which cannot be solved by transposition. After 10 (thus Palmer, followed by many editors) the couplet destroys the close coherence between 9f. and 11f. (*gyrum pulsat equis* etc. continues the sportive activities of 9f.[64]). Transposition after 12 (thus Canter) can hardly be considered seriously because the comparison in 15f. clearly illustrates the martial activities described in 11f. I see no other solution but to leave 15f. where they stand and to assume a lacuna before or after the couplet in order to balance *modo.*

As I have already argued above[65] I assume a lacuna between III. iv. 2 and 3; in xviii I remove with Carutti, Postgate and others the impossible couplet 29f., but do not assume a lacuna, neither between 8 and 9 nor between 24 and 25.[66] I further suspect a lacuna in xix after v. 26. That 27f. cannot follow directly upon 25f. was already seen by Housman but his transposition of the couplet after 24 does not solve the problem because 25f. cannot stand after 27f. Knoche[67] proposed to delete 27f. but the lines are not objectionable in themselves. Due regard for the poem structure commends a lacuna after 26 which would provide for the necessary antecedent to *non tamen immerito* in 27. With a lacuna of one couplet the poem neatly falls into three blocks of 10 lines. 11-20 present five mythical exempla of one couplet each, with a lacuna after 26 the last and extensively treated exemplum comprises exactly the same number of lines as the previous exempla together.

To extend the last item of an enumeration is, of course, a well known structural device which can often be observed elsewhere in Propertius: in II. i. Augustus' triumph after the Alexandrian war (vv. 31-34) covers with four lines exactly the same space as the enumeration of his previous victories (Mutina, Philippi, Perusia, Egypt: vv. 27-30); in II. xxxiv the *Aeneid* and the *Georgics* occupy with ten lines (61-66, 77-80) the same number of lines as the *Bucolica* alone (67-76); in III. xxi each of the three stations of the poet's voyage gets one distich (17-22), the arrival in Athens accordingly six lines (23f., 27-30). The opposite happens in II. xxvi B: Neptune occupies with three couplets (45-50) exactly the same space as the other following minor deities of

---

63 See Knoche 2, 269.

64 Commentators have duly pointed out that Spartan girls did not take part in combat (see most recently Fedeli *ad loc.*) but, as Shackleton Bailey (2, 184) remarks, the distich applies to military drill, "which need not involve actual campaigning".

65 See p. 15 n. 42.

66 See above p. 25 n. 93 and p. 48.

67 See Knoche 2, 269f.

see and weather (Boreas, Scylla and Charybdis, Orion and Haedus) together (51-56). Similarly in I. xv we could observe a series of three examples of decreasing length (Calypso 9-14 = 6 lines; Hypsipyle 17-20 = 4 lines + Euadne's two lines 21f. = 6 lines, and perhaps Alphesiboea's two lines[68]). In some cases the last item of a series which is treated more extensively does not occupy exactly the same space as the previous items together; cf. II. xxxi/ xxxii: the last locality (Pompeius' portico) occupies three distichs (11-16) the previous enumeration of places four (7-10, 1-6[69]); later in the same poem Pasiphae, Danae, Helen and Venus' relationship with Mars occupy one distich each (57-60, 31-34 = 8 lines), Venus' affair with Anchises six lines (35-40[70]). In IV. ii the last and according to his own statement most important dress of Vertumnus covers twelve lines (41f., 13-18, 43-46[71]), all his other dresses together sixteen (23-34, 37-40[72]). Nevertheless, I think the perfect symmetry achieved by the lacuna after 26 in III. xix very much speaks in favour of this solution.

In vii, ix and xi my reconstruction does not involve a different number of lines from the transmission, but I assume that a poem has been lost after viii A (from which 25f. and 35-40 are preserved)[73] and after xviii.[74] In the following table I print line numbers dependent on deletions or lacunae in cursive.

i	38			
ii	+*24*	= 62		
iii	+52		= 114	
iv	*24*			
v	+48	= 72		
vi	+42		= 114	= 228
vii	72			
viii A	+*32*		= 104	
viii B	<44>			
ix	+60		= 104	= 208
x	32			
xi	+72		= 104	

[68] See above p. 124.
[69] See above p. 31.
[70] Together with the lost closing distich of the section (see above pp. 29ff. and 143f.) the two parts are equal in length.
[71] For the verse order see above p. 42f.
[72] For the deletion of 35f. see above p. 124f.
[73] See p. 41f.
[74] See p. 48.

xii	38			
xiii	+ 66		= 104	= 208
xiv	*32*[75]			
xv	*44*			
xvi	+30	= 74	+ 32 = 106	
xvii	42			
xviiiA	+*32*	= 74		
xviiiB	<?32>		+ 32 = 106	+ 106 = 212
xix	*30*			
xx	30	= 60		
xxi	*32*			
xxii	*40*	= 72		
xxiii	24			
xxiv/xxv	38	= 62		+ 72 + 60 = 194

The starting point for establishing the above scheme will be the section x-xiii where no changes to the transmitted line numbers have been adopted. This section most clearly reveals the principle which underlies the numerical pattern of book III: poems of unequal length are paired in such a way that every two adjacent poems together present the same number of lines.[76] This principle is also discernible in xv-xviii A, where my reconstruction depends only on the exclusion of xviii 29f. and xv. 45f. Obviously in the first half, especially in the sections vii-ix and x-xiii, the differences in length between the paired poems are much greater than in the concluding two sections. Whereas in vii-xiii we encounter regular pairs of one very long poem paired with another one of about half its length, in xiv-xxiv/xxv we deal with poems of only slightly varying length, more or less of the size of the shorter poems of section vii-ix. In order to balance the two sections vii-ix and x-xiii which with their four very lengthy poems count 208 lines each, the two concluding sections, composed of shorter poems, xiv-xviiiB and xix-xxiv/xxv, comprise six instead of four elegies, arranged in a different way in each section. As a result these two sections of six poems are almost of the same length as the preceding ones. The introductory section which also consists of six

[75] Assuming the deletion of four lines (17-20) and a lacuna of two lines after 14 or 16.

[76] Regular variation between long and short textual units is an established principle of *variatio* which can also be observed elsewhere; cf. J. Van Sickle on the *Bucolica* in: 'The Book-Roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Book', *Arethusa* 13 (1980) 20, 'Reading Vergil's Eclogue Book', *ANRW* II 31/1 (1980) 576 - 603, *Enc. Virg.* I 551; s. also R. Heinze, *Vergils epische Technik* (³Leipzig/Berlin 1915), 150.

poems of moderate length is composed in a particularly sophisticated way of four alternating blocks of one or two poems counting 62 (i/ii), 52 (iii), 72 (iv/v) and 42 (vi) (= 2 x 114) lines.

The carefully balanced asymmetries which characterise the book composition are echoed in the structure of the longer poems, many of which fall into two halves. The first cycle of three poems (i-iii) presents one short poem composed of three stanzas of equal length (ii = 24 lines: 8 + 8 + 8 lines) framed by two longer poems the first of which (i) falls into two parts of slightly different length (20 + 18 lines: the poet's vocation/ his fame after death), the other (iii) presents a perfect symmetry of two parts of 26 lines (dialogue with Apollo/ dialogue with Calliope), each of which is subdivided into 12 + 14 lines (introduction/ speech of Apollo or Calliope). Both poems of the closely connected pair iv/ v distinctly fall into two parts: iv is symmetrical (12 + 12 lines: Caesar's war plans/ the poet at the future triumph), v is heavily asymmetrical (18 + 30 lines: the folly of greed and war/ the poet's dedication to love and learning). Yet it is hardly chance that iv plus the first half of v equals exactly the line number of vi (24 + 18 = 42) so that iv - vi can be subdivided into a symmetrical series of 42 (iv+va) + 30 (vb) + 42 (vi) lines.

Similar interaction between poems can be observed elsewhere. In my arrangement vii can be divided into four stanzas of 8 lines followed by four stanzas of 10 lines i.e. into 32 + 40 lines; the following poem (viiiA) counts 32 lines. This calculation obviously rests on highly hypothetical grounds; however, one may see my reconstruction confirmed by the fact that it results in units of 32 lines, a structural unit found very often in book III, and it should also be noted that the long poem ending the section vii - ix, i.e. ix, is clearly subdivided into 32 + 28 lines (1-20, 23-34: different men have different vocations/ 21f.[77], 35-60: the poet's choice of life). The lost poem viii B should, on my calculation, have consisted of 44 lines. The first pair of the following section (x/xi) consists, like vii/ viii A, of a sequence of 32 + 72 lines only in reversed order. The longer poem of the pair (xi) again neatly falls into two halves of 28 + 44 lines (the power of women upon men/ Antony and Cleopatra, the most recent and most devastating example). Thus the four central poems of the two sections vii-ix/ x-xiii, viii A - xi, present the sequence 44 + 28 + 32/ 32 + 28 + 44.

However probable or improbable one may find this highly hypothetical reconstruction of this fragmented section, similar observations

---

[77] For Heyworth's transposition see above p. 73f.

can be made in other places where less hypotheses are involved. The second pair of section x-xiii, xii/ xiii, consists of one shorter poem of 38 lines (xii) and a longer one (xiii) whose central part of 32 lines (15-46: the blessings of fidelity and poverty) is framed by two unequal passages (1-14, 47-66 = 14/ 20 lines: avarice the cause of women's infidelity/ the curse of luxury). Together this results in the sequence: 38 (xii) + 14 (xiiia) = 52 = 32 (xiiib) + 20 (xiiic). Similarly, on xiv, counting once again 32 lines, follows the heavily asymmetrical xv, consisting of 12 + 32 lines (1-10, 43f./ 11-42[78]: don't be jealous/ the story of Dirce), resulting in the sequence 32 + 12 + 32 lines. Unfortunately in the second half of this section (xvii-xviiiB) one poem, xviiiB, is missing. However, from xvi onward most poems (now all of similar moderate length) show a remarkably simple stanza composition: xvi = 10 + 10 + 10; xviiiA = 10 + 10 + 12 lines; xix[79] and xx both = 10 + 10 + 10 lines; xxi = 8 + 8 + 8 + 8 lines[80]; xxiii = 10 + 10 + 4 lines. Only the two longer poems xvii and xxii fall into two larger halves: xvii = 20 + 22 (prayer to Bacchus/ the poet's future themes); xxii = 18 + 22 (the marvels of the world/ praise of Italy). xxiv/xxv (= 8 + 10 + 6 + 6 + 8 lines) is deliberately assymetrical[81]

Apart from purely numerical considerations Propertius is very successful in arranging his rather disparate material in a meaningful way according to thematic criteria. After the closely knit introductory cycle (i-iii) stands a closely connected pair (iv/v) followed by a rather exceptional erotic poem. However, as a dramatic dialogue[82] it echoes at least formally the third poem of the first cycle with its two direct speeches.[83] In the next section of four poems (vii-ix) two—presumably closely connected—erotic poems of moderate length (viiiA/B) are framed by two long non-erotic poems (vii - ix), both in a certain sense speaking of men's choice of life (Paetus' folly choice of the life of luxury/ the poet's choice). In the section x-xiii however the two long declamatory poems (xi - xiii), both exploiting the topic of awful behaviour by women, alternate with the two shorter rather unique compositions of much brighter appearance (x - xii: a birthday poem/ admonition of a friend). With the praise of his mistresses qualities in x the poet aptly preludes his diatribe on womens power upon men in

---

78 For the verse order see above p. 128f.
79 See above p. 147.
80 With deletion of 25f.; see above p. 151.
81 It corresponds to I. i which shows the same structure; cf. my paper in *SBAW* mentioned above p. 140 n. 41.
82 See above p. 29 n. 116.
83 For the unity of III. i-vi see also Lefèvre 150f.

xi; xii prepares by way of contrast the theme of avarice and infidelity treated in xiii. The condemnation of avarice and wealth we encountered already in vii: thus this theme frames the two central sections of four poems each, vii- ix and x - xiii.

The following symmetrically composed cycle of six poems (xiv-xviiiB) presents a first half of three erotic poems with little thematic connection against a second half, of which the two preserved poems are non-erotic—or, as regards the first (xvii), a renouncement of love—and so we may assume was presumably the lost xviiiB. The concluding section (xix-xxiv/xxv) consists of three pairs: xix-xx again two erotic poems which have little in common beside identic structure and length; xxi/ xxii and xxiii/xxiv/xxv however show a neat thematic connection: xxi/ xxii: a voyage to Greece of the lovesick Propertius/ a praise of Italy addressed to a friend staying in the Greek east; xxiii/ xxiv/ xxv: the loss of the poet's writing tablets/ Propertius renounces Cynthia and love poetry. Moreover the adieu to the enslavement of love pervades the concluding sections of the book from xvii onwards; the theme is then picked up explicitly in xxi but xix with its emphasis on women being dominated more strongly by passion than men can be read in this context as well. Even the new love announced in xx can be understood as a renouncement of Cynthia.

As regards Propertius' last book already A. Woolley[84] observed that elegies ii-v and vii-x approximate each the same number of lines; in fact, as Goold[85] has pointed out, if the certainly spurious couplet v. 55f. is deleted[86] the number of lines is exactly the same. An even more remarkable pattern results, if one accepts in addition to the exclusion of v. 55f. the three deletions I have proposed in the previous chapter: i. 87f.[87], ii. 35f.[88], viii. 19f.[89] Verse numbers dependent on deletions are again printed in cursive type:

A1	i A	66
B1	i B	*82*
	ii	*62*
	iii	72
	iv	94

---

[84] See 'The Structure of Propertius' Book III', *BICS* 14 (1967), 81.
[85] See Goold (ed.) 8.
[86] See above p. 46 n. 192.
[87] See above p. 129ff.
[88] See above p. 124ff.
[89] See above p. 126f.

C	v	+ 76		= 304
B2	vi	86	+ 82 (B1)	= 168
	vii	96		
	viii	*86*		
	ix	74		
C	x	+ 48		= 304
A2	xi	102	+ 66 (A1)	= 168

We could already observe in the longer poems of book II and even more so in those of book III how the poet moves away from symmetric numerical patterns based on small stanza-like units towards carefully balanced asymmetric blocks. Still, even the longer poems of book III show a composition which can sensibly be expressed in terms of numerical relations. Yet the long poems of books II and III are mostly discursive or at the most partly descriptive. The novelty of book IV consists not only in the large space given to narrative poems but also in the mimetic element found in most compositions of Propertius' last book. It is self-evident that to arrange these poems, all save the short x of almost equal length, according to numerical relations between relatively small blocks could never convey the lively and varied tone the poet aims at. Thus most of the elegies of the last book are composed decidedly asymmetrically or without any clear-cut microstructure as suits the affective speech of iii and v. iii appears to be without any clear-cut structure at all, but the four consecutive poems iv-vii clearly present a parallel structural pattern: central speech framed by two normally more or less unequal blocks: v: 20 + 40 + 16, vii: 12 + 82 + 2; vi has a double frame: a) 1-14 and 69-86 (18 lines) = introduction and conclusion; b) the narrative framing Apollo's speech (37-54 = 18 lines): 15-36 (22 lines) and 55-68 (14 lines), i.e. 14 + 22 + 18 + 14 + 18. Only iv shows the symmetrical arrangement: 30 + 36 +30. Only the first three poems show a somehow balanced pattern of several blocks of moderate length: i A = 16 + 12 + 10 + 16 + 12 (the sites of ancient Rome/ the religious rites of old/ brief central section = transition: the Roman ancestors/ Troy reborn/ the poet's task); i B = 4 + 14 + 14 (= 32) + 18 + 16 + 16 (=32) (introduction/ Horus warns the poet and introduces himself/ proof of Horus' trustworthiness/ astrology the only true prophetic art/ Propertius' personal data/ his future task).

The composition of ii[90] is perfectly parallel to that of i A: 14 + 8 + 18 + 14 + 8 (Vertumnus' Tuscan origin/ false etymologies of his name/ correct etymology of his name amply illustrated by his various

[90] For the text see above p. 42f.

dresses/ his most important function/ conclusion). The main body of Cornelia's speech (xi) is composed of two large central blocks of equal length (36 lines each: 27-60, 65f.: Cornelia's life/ 61-64, 67f., 71-96, 69f., 97f.: commands to her family), framed by an *exordium* of 26 lines (1-26) and a short *peroratio* of two distichs (99-102).

With regard to the numerical pattern of book IV already Goold observed that the abnormal shortness of x may have been dictated by reasons of space on a papyrus roll. To be sure, book IV is rather a short book, and surely posed no problem as regards the length of the roll, but one may guess that a column should have ended with IV. x. If the lay-out of the book was supposed to represent somehow the book structure with the doubly framed blocks ii-v and vii-x one may indeed guess that both iA and xi should each have occupied a series of complete columns so as to allow the almost equal length of the blocks i B - v and vi - x to become apparent. This could have been achieved easily if the line number of the column varied between 33 and 36 lines (a perfectly normal column height). Then i A may have occupied two columns of 33 lines, xi three columns of 34 lines, framing iB - v and vi - x with eleven columns of 35-36 lines for each block.

In book III too, the fact that every section of four or six poems shows a fairly equal comprehensive number of lines would allow to give each section the same space on the roll, again provided that the line number varies slightly. Again, with a column height of between 30 and 38 lines per column every pair or trio of poems could be written in two columns thus splendidly showing the interlacing twofold structure of the different blocks. In fact, if the first section was written in columns of 38 lines per column the first three columns would contain: col. i = i, col. ii = ii + iiia, col. iii = iiib-d.[91]

If many readers will dismiss most of the above calculations as resting on too hypothetical evidence I wish to point in conclusion to the following facts. A certain amount of convergence in line numbers between various parts of books or blocks of poems can be observed without any interference with line numbers (either by deletion or assumption of lacunae). The principles of book composition for the single books appear, not only for book I, at least approximately from the transmitted text. Almost all textual operations postulated above strongly recommend themselves on grounds in no way connected with numerical reasons, and in books I, III and IV they are relatively

---

[91] All this is, of course, calculated on the assumption that poems were not set off by a blank space. If one objects to uneven line numbers for columns in distichic poetry one may remember that the Gallus papyrus starts a column with a pentameter.

few in relation to the amount of text. Indeed, far from giving free way to wild speculations I think the convergence to a numerical scheme of book composition in books I and III in particular severely restricts major textual operations affecting line numbers to a moderate amount. It seems implausible that the numerical structure would shine through in the transmitted text as clearly as it still does if the text of these books were disfigured too severely by text loss and interpolation. In fact, even if one accepts my radical hypothesis for book III major text losses are strictly confined to two places.

As regards interpolation let me stress that even on the most generous hypothesis advanced by me the amount of interpolation I have postulated in Propertius is extremely small. In book I I have assumed hesitantly a maximum of 6 interpolated lines in a book of 706 transmitted lines; in book III I have assumed 12 spurious lines and two interpolations of lacunae (3 lines) which do not affect the comprehensive line number in a book of 990 transmitted lines; in book IV I assume 8 lines to be interpolated (+ 1 interpolation of a lacuna) in a book of 952 transmitted lines. Thus in book I and IV interpolation is less than 1%, in book III only slightly more than 1% (*c.* 1. 2%). I may add that even in book II interpolation is more than modest; beside the deletions argued for in the previous chapters (vi. 41f.[92], ix. 29f.[93], xxii. 11f.[94], xxvi. 28[95], xxxiv. 39[96]) I regard as certainly spurious only xxiii. 23f. (del. Plessis, 'Schlußinterpolation'[97]) and xxviii. 21f.[98] and perhaps some lines in xv.[99] The number of interpolated lines (10-14 lines, perhaps some four or six lines in xv and two interpolations in lacunae) is still distinctly below 2% in a book of 1362 lines even on the most generous assumption.

Book II is, as I have argued in detail, very lacunose; in book III I assume that two complete poems are lost save a few fragments, but I postulate only three minor lacunae. In book I I hesitantly would consider two lacunae and perhaps the loss of a few lines at the end of the book. In book IV I assume no lacunae (except the interpolated one). In order to arrive at a precise numerical pattern for the book structure in book I only one single textual operation is necessary. One

---

92 See above p. 120.
93 See p. 132.
94 See p. 125f.
95 See p. 82f.
96 See p. 83f.
97 Shackleton Bailey's (2, 109) interpretation (accepted by Enk *ad loc.*) is oversubtle.
98 See p. 124 n. 274.
99 See p. 141f.

may doubt whether the five textual operations considered by me above can be justified with the numerical result achieved. In book III my numerical scheme appears to rest on assumption of two lost poems but a system of precise symmetries for part of the book arises already from eight minor operations (five deletions and three lacunae). In book IV a precise numerical symmetry for part of the book is achieved by one single deletion about which there is no doubt anyway; my scheme rests on four interpolations only in the whole book.

CHAPTER FOUR

A FEW CONCLUSIONS FOR THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF PROPERTIUS

As I have said in the introduction, a major factor which contributed to the lack of enthusiasm among scholars towards the two approaches to Propertian criticism discussed in the previous chapters was the claim of some of their adherents to be able to solve most major problems of the text by one single method. In contrast to such over-confidence it cannot be stressed enough that credence can only be given to these violent interferences with the text as, in particular, to wholesale transposition, if we restrict ourselves to a limited number of really convincing examples, and if we remain conscious of the limited degree of likelihood attainable in every single case. The problems of the text of Propertius preclude certainties, and the hypothetical nature of the solutions proposed by me does not invite us to go too far in reconstructing the material evidence behind the process of corruption; undoubtedly many will already find the few hints about the concrete process of dislocation I have given on occasions in the preceding sections unduly speculative. Given the many uncertainties and the highly complicated character of the evidence it may seem wise not to go further in reconstructing the concrete nature of the archetype and the process of corruption, and I certainly do not want to go too far in reconstructing an archetypal ms. from so uncertain and tiny evidence as is available to us, but there are some curious coincidences which spring to the eye if one accepts the hypotheses on text losses in the archtype advanced by me.

It has been observed already in the past[1] that the lacunae in N are concentrated mainly in certain well defined areas, namely between II. xxxiii - III. ii and III. ix - xi. Similar observations can be made for the major losses of text. First of all, these losses occur almost exclusively in book II. The only exception is one such area in book III where elegies vii and viii seem to be affected by major losses and, in consequence, major dislocations.[2] A further area of damage is responsible for the dislocations in IV. ii.[3]

---

[1] See Butrica p. 84.
[2] Above p. 38ff.
[3] See p. 42f.

There are no lacunae and only one mechanical dislocation in book I,[4] and there is comparatively little of this sort in books III and IV. If we leave aside dislocations caused by interpolation, book III shows, beside the problems in vii and viii, only five necessary transpositions of single couplets,[5] and there are seven in book IV.[6] In book II we could locate two areas of a major loss of text comprising a whole series of poems between iii and iv,[7] and, if our hypothetical reconstruction of the process of dislocation for xxii B is correct in its outline, between xvii. 4/xxii B and xxiii.[8] Major losses of text, leading to dislocations, could further be observed in vi[9] and a large lacuna disfigures ix.[10] Text losses lurk also behind the major and minor transpositions necessary in xvi,[11] directly adjacent to the large lacuna after xvii. 4/ xxiiB, and the text between xvii. 4 and xxiii, when it was recovered later, was still defective in xviii A/B/C and the final line of xxii B. It is worth pointing out that the necessary transpositions of single distichs in book II occur all but one (in xiv)[12] either in poems which are in any case affected by major losses, i.e. in iv[13] and xvi,[14] or at least close to a major lacuna (in viii and xxiv B). After xxiii we discovered text losses in at least every second poem up to the end of the book, i.e. in xxiv, xxvi, xxviii, xxx, xxxii, xxxiii, xxxiv.[15]

If we review this distribution of major text losses together with that of the minor lacunae in N we get a remarkably coherent picture. After the area of gross mechanical damage between iii and iv we find some further losses in vi and ix followed by a place of minor damage at xiii. 49. A second area of extensive damage between xvii and xxiii is preceded by a rather severely damaged poem, xvi, and followed in remarkable regularity by further cases of considerable damage in xxiv, xxvi, xxviii, xxx, xxxii, xxxiii and xxxiv. Towards the end of II. xxxiv the damage to the text begins again to be limited to smaller areas and such minor damage extends up to III. ii. After this we meet again an area of major damage in III. vii and viii, which is directly followed by minor losses in ix and xi.

---

4 See above p. 140.
5 See above p. 50f.
6 See p. 51f.
7 Above p. 7f.
8 Above p. 19ff.
9 Above p. 24ff.
10 Above p. 15f.
11 Above p. 26.
12 Above p. 49.
13 Above p. 49.
14 See above p. 35ff.
15 See p. 19ff.

I have mentioned above[16] that the dislocations in II. xvi and xxviii may have been caused by a scribe skipping over a page of 14 lines. Much damage to the integrity of the text concentrates at the end of book II, i.e. in xxxii-xxxiv. II. xxxiv is disfigured by two missing line ends in v. 53 and 83[17] and by a missing line which is now filled in by interpolation, v. 39.[18] On closer inspection a certain regularity in the distances between these damages reveals itself, a regularity which may suggest that the same reason affected one or more subsequent folia of the same ms.[19] Curiously enough the missing line 39 and the missing line end in v. 53 are exactly 14 lines apart. The distance between the missing line ends in 53 and 83 is 30 lines. Perhaps damage causing illegibility, e.g. by damp, of the same folia caused the loss of a line end on the verso (i.e. of v. 53) and a complete line on the recto (i.e. v. 39). The damage may have extended to the following folium. If on the last folium of the book the number of lines increased to 15 lines per page the damaged spot in the inner margin of the preceding folium may not have caused any harm to the beginning of the corresponding verse on its recto since this verse was an indented pentameter (i.e. v. 68 or 78; depending on whether or not the ms. already had the wrong sequence of our tradition[20]). It may however have affected the end of the corresponding line on the verso, i.e. v. 83, especially because this is a very long line.

Close to xxxiv we encounter a large lacuna between xxxiii. 40 and 41.[21] If this lacuna was caused by the loss of a folium, v. 41 should have been the first line of a recto. Assuming the absence of poem division by a blank space and 14 lines per page the verso started with

---

16 See above p. 26ff.

17 See above p. 71f.

18 See above p. 83ff.

19 For a similar case of reflexes of mechanical damage in the exemplar upon later copies cf. archetype of Callimachus' hymns (see the most recent survey of the tradition in A.W. Bulloch, *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn* [Cambridge 1985], pp. 68ff.) or the Plato - ms. F (Vind. Suppl. gr. 39): already A.C. Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford 1918), 414-417, had noted the remarkable number of omissions of 33-38 letters in F. On the basis of regular intervals between a number of omissions E. R. Dodds, 'Notes on some Manuscripts of Plato', *JHS* 77 (1957), 26f. and in his Gorgias (Oxford 1959), pp. 45-47, has shown convincingly that the ms. descends from an uncial codex affected by mechanical damage, and after him R.S. Bluck, *Plato's Meno* (Cambridge 1961), p. 138 n. 3, has argued that the exemplar was injured by damp, in any case a form of damage causing illegibility rather than complete loss, as several attempts of the scribe to decipher barely legible traces can still be detected (for a recent account of previous research see also Boter 99f.). This comes very close to the hypothesis I shall advance for Propertius.

20 See above p. 32.

21 See above p. 18f.

xxxiv. 11, the next recto with 25, the verso with 39. This means the lost line xxxiv. 39, the damaged line 53 and, if our reconstruction is correct, even 83 constituted each the first line of a page, a position obviously exposed to mechanical damage. Of course, we have assumed above that 39 stood on a recto. This is still possible if the loss before xxxiii. 41 was not caused by the loss of a folium but by skipping over an opening or a page, and thus 41 began a verso. The calculation works even further back. Reckoning with pages of 14 lines and absence of poem division by spatium pages begin with xxxiii. 37, 13 and xxxii. 61. Before the latter line we have assumed a lacuna of which ten lines, 31-40, were recovered later and wrongly inserted after v. 30.[22] Similar calculations work even further in book III. As Dr Heyworth points out to me the two missing line ends III. i. 27 and III. v. 39 affect the 27th and the 177th verse of the book.[23]

Because of the highly fragmentary condition of the text in the first part of book II matters are on the whole too complicated to allow analogous calculations, but if my hypothesis of the loss of several folia (comprising II. xvii. 5 - xxiiA) after II. xxiiB in its original location between II. xvii. 3 and 4 should be correct[24], II. xvii. should have started a new folium. If we exclude the dislocated interpolation xvii. 13f.[25] the number of lines up to the next major lacuna, that before xviii A, is again fourteen.

It would seem that even in the much destroyed sections of book II the physical appearance of the ms. in which the losses of text occurred faintly shine through. Yet, as I have already pointed out occasionally[26], the sometimes highly complicated processes of dislocation presume in all probability the intentional interference of a redactor, and here we come to the point where further speculations about the process of corruption cease to be possible. In any case, as a result of our investigation on verbal interpolation it is abundantly clear that the archetype of our text of Propertius was subject to a considerable degree of intentional manipulation. We have seen that intentional rewriting of the text for its own sake remained on a very small scale and, in consequence, purely additive interpolation of distichs is rather rare.[27] In a text not forming part of the school curriculum and ac-

---

22 See above p. 29f.

23 This works even on my assumption that II. 1f. is interpolated (see above p. 146 n. 62); with the lacuna of one distich after III. iv. 3 (above p. 15 n. 42) the comprehensive number of lines in this section remains unchanged.

24 See above p. 19ff.

25 See p. 127.

26 See above p. 42f. and 44f.

27 See p. 113.

companied by learned annotation it is also plausible that corruption from intrusive glosses and other marginal and interlinear comments is not much in evidence. Still a text which suffered destruction on such a scale had to be revised in some, however superficial way in order to become readable, and the evidence predominantly reveals emendation of the most obvious defects, i.e. those caused by text loss: metrically defective lines or passages were mended by verbal interpolation or even by the insertion of missing lines or parts of lines. With some rare exceptions the quality of these emendatory efforts is enormously poor, most metrical interpolation appears to be medieval[28]; our text bears all the signs of being the result of the uncoordinated and uncontrolled activity of scribes in a badly transmitted author unprotected by a learned tradition and disciplined textual criticism, and it is precisely this dangerous coincidence which rendered the text of Propertius so untractable.

---

[28] For the quality of metrical interpolation in late antiquity cf. the text of E in Seneca's tragedies, see Zwierlein 25.

INDICES

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

(Modern scholars of the post war period, in particular the authors of modern standard editions and commentaries, to which reference is made continuously, are not included in the index)

Alexandrine editions *12*
Apostoles, Michael *70 n. 22*
Aristarchus of Samothrake *45 n. 188*
author's variants *115 n. 231; 119 with n. 245; 126f. with n. 288*
aut si ... sin *19 n. 62*

Baehrens, Ae. *24f.; 49; 85f.; 93; 107*
Becadelli, Antonio (Panormita) *90*
Beroaldus, P. *107*
Birt, Th. *7*
Burman, P. *19; 107*

Carutti, D. *26; 32; 37; 43; 47; 147*
carmen *5 n. 13*

division of parts in dramatic texts *6f.*

elegy book
  closure *11f.*
  cycles *19ff.*
  dramatic development *11f. n. 39*
  introductory poem *8ff.*
  opening of book refers to end of previous book *12*
  pairs of poems (dramatic) *21f. with n. 75; 24 n. 90*
  programmatic poems *8ff.*
  structure *133ff.*
    numerical *133ff.*
enim *99 n. 144*
epigrams
  structure of collections *4f. n. 10; 12 n. 37 and n. 39*
Fontein, P. *35f.; 49; 125*
Gallus
  Gallus papyrus *4f.*
  structure of book of elegies *6f.*

Haupt, M. *50*
Heinsius, N. *97f.; 105; 115; 125*
hinnulei / inulei *104 n. 177*
Housman, A. E. *2; 20f.; 26; 32; 36 n. 152; 71; 110; 112; 114f.; 127; 131; 140; 143; 147*

Jachmann, G. *67; 81; 120; 130; 141*
Jacob, F.: *52*

Keil, H. *50; 92*
Knoche, U. *21f.; 67; 81; 120; 123; 146f.*

Lachmann, K. *6ff.; 20f.; 25; 50; 78; 92; 110; 121; 126; 146*
lectional signs
  paragraphos *5 with n. 11*
  spatium *4f. with n. 11*
  ekthesis *5 n. 11*
  coronis *5 n. 11*
  asteriskos *5 n. 11*
length of a papyrus roll *5*

manuscripts
  book division *12 with n. 39*
  corruption of proper names *38 n. 157*
  deletion
    intentional *52*
  dislocated fragments added at the end of a section *24ff.; 27 n. 107*
    at the beginning *27 n. 106*
  interpolation
    decency *112*
    dislocation as evidence for interpolation *78; 115ff.*
    drastic *109*
    in lacunae *67ff.*
    'Konkordanzinterpolation' *108 n. 201*
    metrical *104 n. 177*
    of a defective text *69ff.*
    of a 'Lesetext' *68*
    of pronouns *86f.; 100; 109f.*
    of proper names *111*
    prosodic errors *84*

'Schlußinterpolation' *17 n. 54; 120ff.*
'Vervollständigung' *123ff.*
intrusion of parallel versions or quotations from the margin *44 n. 193*
loss of folia or openings *8; 28*
omission of columns *29 n. 115*
omission of metrically defective lines *75f.; 88*
omission of pages *28f.*
partial omission of spurious passages *117 n. 237; 119 n. 246*
partial restitution of omitted passages *27f.*
poem division *3f.*
enlarged initials *5 n. 11*
poem titles *5 n. 11*
restitution by insertion of one or more folia *28f.; 33f.*
restitution leads to duplication *34 n. 141; 35 n. 145*
shortenings *52 with n. 230*
transposition
intentional *42ff.; 79*
over a long distances *44; 46*
integration of parallel versions *45*
medius 16 n. 45
Menander *105*
Monobiblos *7 n. 19*
Müller, L. *32; 39ff.; 85; 129*
Muret, M.A. *112*

Palmer, A. *86; 102; 111; 147*
Paolo of Viterbo *91. n. 109; 104 n. 178; 105 n. 181*
Passerat, J. *21f.; 77f.*
Petrarca, Francesco *75f.*
Phillimore, J. S. *46f.; 97; 125*
poem structure
closure *8 n. 21; 28f. n. 113*
dialogues *29 with n. 116*
dramatic unity *21f. with n. 75*
exempla arranged in a series of decreasing length *124*
stanzas composition *133ff.*
ποίημα *5 n. 13*
Pontani, Giovanni *19; 91 n. 108; 105*
Postgate, J. P. *39; 47; 49; 51; 92; 100; 147*
Propertius
book I:
end *11f.*
structure *140*
book II:
a conflation of two books *6ff.*
date *10 n. 29*
dislocation of poems *10*
fragments *12ff.; 15; 19; 26*
lacunae *7f.; 17f.*
structure *145*
book III
fragments *41f.*
structure *145ff.*
book IV
structure *153ff.*
epigrams *18 n. 59*
language, style and metre
change of address *36f. n.151*
address with bare possessive pronoun *15*
adjectives in *-fer* *74*
adjectives in *-us* at the end of hexameter *72*
prosodic licences *73*
quae (indefinite) *99*
-que after short *e* *93*
word end after long third anceps *93f.*
transmission
agreement in error between A/Π/Λ *93f. n. 117*
amount of interpolation *155*
archetype of 14/5: lines *28; 159ff.*
concentration of lacunae *159ff.*
contamination of Λ with Π *76f.; 88*
damage to the beginning of a line *85ff.*
dislocation *1ff.*
of single couplets *43ff.*
indirect tradition *108f.*
interpolation in A/Π *85ff. n. 92; 88 n. 103*
interpolation in Λ *76f.; 86ff.*
interpolation in N *86f. n. 92*
interpolation common to N/Λ *93ff.*
interpolation common to A/Π/Λ *85ff.*
metrical interpolation *81ff.; 92ff.*
interpolation after first couplet *125ff.*
interpolation by Petrarch *80*
interpolation of single lines *73ff.*
interpolation of half lines *70ff.; 107f.*

interpolation of last word of the line *107 n. 197*
intrusive glosses *87f.n. 92; 109ff.*
lacunae in N *67ff.*
line ends missing in N *70f.*
poem division *3ff.*
single lines missing in N *73ff.*
single words omitted in N *85ff.*
stemma *94f.*
substitution of rare forms *108f.*
survivals of truth in Λ *75f.; 80f.*
variants in the archetype *88; 94f.*
word interpolation *85ff.*

Richmond, O.L. *1f.; 43; 49; 51; 67; 77; 97; 139*
recusatio *12; 130f.*
Scaliger, Joseph Justus *1; 38f.; 104; 122; 129*

Volscus, A. *104*

Zenodotus of Ephesus *45 n. 188*

INDEX LOCORUM

Arch. fr. 196: *13 n. 39*

Eur.
Alc. 144f.: *44 n. 186*
Andr. 73: *44 n. 186*
Andr. 397–8: *120*
Andr. 1279–82: *120 n. 250*
Cycl. 392: *44 n. 186*
El. 360: *120*
El. 1097–1101: *120 n. 250*
El. 1107f.: *44 n. 186*
El. 1295–7: *44 n. 186*
Hcld. 402: *44 n. 186*
Hcld. 948f.: *44 n. 186*
Hec. 754ff.: *117*
HF 870: *44 n. 186*
HF 1184ff.: *44 n. 186*
Hipp. 663: *120*
IA 373–5: *120 n. 250*
IA 749f.: *120 n. 250*
Ion 830f.: *120 n. 250*
Ion 1275–8: *120*
Med. 725ff.: *115*
Med. 784–6: *117*

Hes.
Thg. 19: *117*

Hom.
Il. xx. 223–4: *116*
Od. i. 93–9: *44; 116*
Od. i. 146–9: *116*
Od. vii. 69: *100*
Od. xi. 603–4: *44, 116*

Hor.
C. I xxiii. 1: *108 n. 117*
C. I. xxvii: *22 n. 75*
C. II. ix. 17ff.: *13 n. 39*
C. III. ix: *29 n. 116*
C. IV. i. 1: *10 n. 29*
ep. I. v: *134 n. 4*
ep. I. xi: *134 n. 4*
ep. I. xiv: *134 n. 4*
ep. I. xx: *134 n. 4*
iamb. xi: *13 n. 39*
iamb. xi: *13 n. 39*
sat. I. vii: *134 n. 4*

Iuv.
xi. 162–6: *119*

Luc.
iv. 316ff.: *121*
v. 554–7: *119*

Lycophr.
1129: *130 n. 302*

Ov.
AA i. 68ff.: *31*
AA ii. 187ff.: *110 n. 208*
Am. III. vi. 35: *16 n. 46*
Am. III. vi. 103: *16 n. 46*
Fast. 523–6: *129*
Her. xvi. 168ab: *44*
Her. xv. 122: *112*
Her. v. 21–26: *118*
Her. xv [xvi] 31: *80 n. 64*
Her. xvi 165–8: *118*
Her. xvii. 208: *132 n. 313*
Ib. 133f.: *118*
Met. i. 544a–547a: *45 n. 187; 115 n. 231*
Met. iii. 660: *132 n. 313*
Met. vii. 144ff.: *115 n. 231*
ex Pont. III. ii. 67: *80 n. 64*

Plut.
Ant. 56, 6–7: *106 n. 185*
Brut. 21, 5: *106 n. 185*

Prop.
I. i: *138 n. 26; 139f.*
I. i. 1: *10 n. 29*
I. i. 11f.: *109f.*
I. i. 33: *96*
I. ii: *137f.; 138 n. 24*
I. ii. 1f.: *46*
I. ii. 8: *108 n. 199*
I. ii. 9: *110*
I. iii: *138 n. 24*
I. iv: *139*
I. iv. 1–4: *136 n. 13*
I. iv. 5–10: *136 n. 11*
I. iv. 7ff.: *136 n. 9*
I. iv. 17ff.: *136 n. 9*

I. v. 8: *2 n. 2*
I v. 13–18: *136 n. 12 and n. 14*
I. vi: *83 n. 76; 134; 138 n. 24*
I. vi. 7: *136 n. 14*
I. vi. 9: *96*
I. vii: *22 n. 75; 138*
I. vii. 15: *136 n. 14*
I. vii. 21–26: *122 n. 262; 131*
I. viii: *14 n. 41; 21 n. 75; 136 n. 12; 138 n. 24*
I. viii. 1ff.: *136 n. 9*
I. viii. 13f.: *48*
I. ix: *22 n. 75; 138 n. 24*
I. ix. 1–8: *136 n. 12*
I. ix. 9–14: *136 n. 13*
I. ix. 13: *97*
I. ix. 23f.: *136 n. 10*
I. x: *22 n. 75; 138 n. 24*
I. x. 28: *2 n. 2*
I. xi/ xii: *22 n. 75*
I. xi: *138 n. 24*
I. xi. 1–8: *136 n. 13*
I. xi. 11: *2 n. 2*
I. xi. 15f.: *136 n. 13*
I. xi. 17: *110*
I. xi. 29: *2 n. 2*
I. xii: *138 n. 24*
I. xii. 1–10: *136 n. 13*
I. xii. 2: *38 n. 157*
I. xiii: *22 n. 75; 138 n. 24*
I. xiii. 13: *85*
I. xiii. 19ff.: *136 n. 9*
I. xiii. 24: *2 n. 2*
I. xiii. 33–36: *122 n. 262*
I. xiv: *138 n. 24*
I. xiv. 1–8: *136 n. 11*
I. xiv. 7f.: *136 n. 10*
I. xiv. 15f.: *136 n. 10*
I. xv. 15f.: *140*
I. xv. 13–24: *123*
I. xvi: *138*
I. xvi. 2: *38 n. 157*
I. xvi. 9–14: *121*
I. xvi. 11f.: *140*
I. xvi. 23: *2 n. 2; 126 n. 283*
I. xvii: *83 n. 76; 138 n. 24*
I. xvii. 1: *25 n. 94*
I. xvii. 3: *1 n. 1*
I. xvii. 25–28: *122 n. 262*
I. xviii: *138 n. 24*
I. xviii. 16: *76 n. 55*
I. xviii. 27f.: *97*
I. xix: *83 n. 76; 138 n. 24*
I. xix. 5f.: *136 n. 10*
I. xix. 17f. *97*
I. xix. 19: *1 n. 1*
I. xx: *138*
I. xx. 7: *1 n. 1; 97*
I. xx. 29f.: *98*
II. i: *8; 144 with n. 55; 147*
II. i. 5f.: *98; 107 n. 197*
II. i. 37f.: *17*
II. i. 53: *2 n. 2*
II. i. 58: *90 n. 105; 107f. with n. 199*
II. i. 71: *10 n. 28*
II. i. 78: *15 n. 41*
II. ii. 9–12: *46f.*
II. ii. 11f.: *17; 47ff.*
II. iii: *7; 142*
II. iii. 4: *10 n. 29*
II. iii. 11f.: *45 n. 191*
II. iii. 15: *98*
II. iii. 21f.: *98*
II. iii. 25: *86*
II. iii. 27: *93*
II. iii. 45–54: *8*
II. iii. 49f.: *111*
II. iv: *7*
II. iv. 9f. *49*
II. v: *141*
II. v. 1ff.: *20 n. 68*
II. vi: *14 n. 41; 24f., 144*
II. vi. 6f. *25*
II. vi. 11f.: *98f.*
II. vi. 33f.: *25 n. 94*
II. vi. 35f.: *25*
II. vi. 35–42: *28*
II. vi. 41f.: *120*
II. vii. 12: *14f. n. 41*
II. vii. 43–66: *40*
II. viii: *8f., 142*
II. viii. 3f.: *16*
II. viii. 10: *2 n. 2*
II. viii. 25f.: *1 n. 1; 49*
II. viii. 30: *38 n. 157*
II. ix: *8; 14 n. 41; 142*
II. ix. 13–18: *99f.*
II. ix. 25–32: *132*
II. ix. 41–52: *15f. with n. 43*
II. x: *9ff.; 14 n. 41; 142 n. 48*
II. x. 7f. *9*
II. x. 22: *2 n. 2*
II. x. 23: *107 n. 197*
II. xi: *9; 11f.*
II. xii: *11f., 141*
II. xii. 15: *8 n. 21*
II. xii. 18: *114 n. 223*
II. xiii: *1 n. 1; 9ff.;144f.*

II. xiii. 3f.: *11*
II. xiii. 17: *10 n. 28; 93*
II. xiii. 25: *10 n. 29*
II. xiii. 37f.: *100*
II. xiii. 47: *97*
II. xiii. 47f.: *101*
II. xiii. 49: *85*
II. xiii. 55: *2 n. 2*
II. xiv: *141*
II. xiv. 13f.: *49*
II. xv: *141f.*
II. xv. 39: *101*
II. xvi: *14 n. 41; 26; 32; 35ff.*
II. xvi. 11f.: *36*
II. xvi. 17f.: *93; 132 n. 312*
II. xvi. 27: *36 n. 151*
II. xvi. 29f.: *26; 37*
II. xvi. 31–42: *28*
II. xvi. 33f.: *26*
II xvii: *20; 143*
II. xvii. 13f.: *20; 37*
II. xviii: *14 n. 41; 83 n. 76*
II. xviii. 1–4: *18 n. 58; 122*
II. xviii. 4f.: *17f.*
II. xviii. 5: *91*
II. xviii. 10: *2 n. 2*
II. xviii. 19–22: *122*
II. xviii. 29ff.: *33*
II. xviii. 31f.: *33 n. 137*
II. xviii. 35ff.: *33 n. 138*
II. xix: *141; 142 n. 48*
II. xx: *141*
II. xx. 8: *2 n. 2*
II. xxi: *141*
II. xxii: *20f.; 33*
II. xxii. 7–14: *125*
II. xxii. 43: *19 n. 62*
II. xxii. 43–50: *17; 19*
II. xxii. 50: *73*
II. xxii. 49f.: *80*
II. xxiii: *21; 142*
II. xxiii. 21f.: *92*
II. xxiii. 23f.: *120 n. 251; 155*
II. xxiv: *10 n. 30; 14 n. 41; 21*
II. xxiv. 1–10: *17 n. 54*
II. xxiv. 1f.: *10 n. 29 and n. 30*
II. xxiv. 4: *17 n. 54*
II. xxiv. 10f.: *17*
II. xxiv. 47f. *49*
II. xxiv. 51f.: *122 n. 262*
II. xxv: *141*
II. xxv. 2: *2 n. 2*
II. xxv. 35: *1 n. 1*
II. xxvi: *14 n. 41; 147*
II. xxvi. 23: *38 n. 157*
II. xxvi. 27–30: *82*
II. xxvi. 29: *14 n. 41*
II. xxvii: *141*
II. xxvii. 6: *101*
II. xxvii. 10: *15 n. 42*
II. xxviii: *14 n. 41; 21ff.; 143*
II. xxviii. 11: *1 n. 1*
II. xxviii. 21f.: *155; 124 n. 274*
II. xxviii. 31f.: *23*
II. xxviii. 33f.: *15 n. 41; 22*
II. xxviii. 33–46: *22*
II. xxviii. 39f.: *102*
II. xxviii. 47ff.: *14 n. 41; 22f.*
II. xxviii. 51: *101*
II. xxviii. 53f.: *2 n. 2; 76 n. 55*
II. xxviii. 57f.: *46f.*
II. xxviii. 59–62: *122 n. 262*
II. xxix: *14 n. 41; 141f.*
II. xxx: *14 n. 41; 141*
II. xxx. 1–12: *17; 32*
II. xxx. 16: *76 n. 55*
II. xxx. 19: *25 n. 94; 87f.*
II. xxx. 19–22: *31*
II. xxx. 21: *93*
II. xxxi/ xxxii: *10 n. 30; 144; 145 n. 55; 148*
II. xxxii: *29f.*
II. xxxii. 5f.: *1 n. 1; 101*
II. xxxii. 7–10: *31*
II. xxxii. 21f.: *92*
II. xxxii. 25ff.: *29*
II. xxxii. 31–40: *30*
II. xxxii. 33: *89 n. 104*
II. xxxii. 35: *111*
II. xxxii. 37: *100*
II. xxxii. 40: *2 n. 2*
II. xxxii. 41f.: *30*
II. xxxii. 49: *29*
II. xxxii. 55: *29*
II. xxxii. 61f.: *30; 101*
II. xxxiii: *14 n. 41; 83 n. 76; 145f.*
II. xxxiii. 21f.: *122 n. 262*
II. xxxiii. 41–44: *18f.*
II. xxxiv: *83f.*
II. xxxiv. 21: *89 n. 104*
II. xxxiv. 23: *93*
II. xxxiv. 31ff. *11*
II. xxxiv. 33: *16 n. 46*
II. xxxiv. 33–46: *83*
II. xxxiv. 47–50: *32*
II. xxxiv. 53: *70*
II. xxxiv. 77–80: *32*
II. xxxiv. 83: *70; 72*

II. xxxiv. 93f.: *102*
III. i. 1ff.: *11*
III. i. 13: *102*
III. i. 23: *89 n. 104*
III. i. 27: *70*
III. ii. 1f.: *14 n. 41; 102; 146*
III. ii. 13: *2 n. 2*
III. ii. 16: *86*
III. iii. 33: *2 n. 2*
III. iii. 42: *2 n. 2*
III. iii. 48: *107 n. 197*
III. iv. 2f.: *80 n. 64; 147*
III. iv. 4: *15 n. 42*
III. iv. 13–18: *51*
III. iv. 16–20: *1 n. 1*
III. v. 14: *102*
III. v. 15: *103*
III. v. 23f.: *89f.*
III. v. 39: *70*
III. vi.: *29 n. 116*
III. vi. 3f.: *51; 76 n. 54*
III. vi. 5f.: *112*
III. vi. 9: *91; 104 n. 178*
III. vii: *14 n. 41; 38ff.*
III. vii. 11: *15 n. 42*
III. vii. 17-20: *39 with n. 159; 43*
III. vii. 21-24: *38; 39 n. 159; 43*
III. vii. 25f.: *92*
III. vii. 51ff.: *40 n. 161*
III. vii. 60: *103*
III. viii. 3f.: *50f.*
III. viii. 11: *2 n. 2*
III. viii. 25f.: *41f.*
III. viii. 35–40: *41*
III. viii. 37f.: *109*
III viii. 37–40: *122 n. 262*
III. ix. 21f.: *50; 73*
III. ix. 33f.: *17 n. 50; 46f.; 47 n. 195; 73*
III. ix. 35: *73; 79f.*
III. ix. 44: *103*
III. x 17f.: 69; *76 n. 54*
III. x. 23: *97*
III. xi. 5: *114 n. 223*
III. xi. 29: *104 n. 178*
III. xi. 53–72: *74ff.*
III. xi. 58: *1 n. 1; 74; 79f.*
III. xi. 62: *2 n. 2*
III. xi. 65f.: *2 n. 2; 77*
III. xi. 67f.: *77ff.*
III. xi. 71f.: *122 n. 262*
III. xiii. 35: *2 n. 2; 103*
III. xiii. 39f.: *105*
III. xiii. 42: *15 n. 42*
III. xiii. 61f.: *104*
III. xiv. 17–20: *146*
III. xv. 11: *14 n. 41*
III. xv. 31f.: *92*
III. xv. 39–46: *128; 122 n. 262*
III. xv. 45f.: *146*
III. xvi: *151*
III. xvi. 13f.: *109*
III. xvi. 19f. *51; 109 n. 205*
III. xvii: *151*
III. xvii. 24: *2 n. 2*
III. xvii. 27f.: *111*
III. xvii. 37–40: *105*
III. xviii: *151*
III. xviii. 2: *2 n. 2*
III. xviii. 9: *38 n. 157*
III. xviii. 19f.: *114*
III. xviii. 29f.: *46f.*
III. xix: *151*
III. xix. 26f.: *147*
III. xx: *82 n. 74; 151*
III. xx. 4: *105*
III. xx. 12f.: *82 n. 74*
III. xx. 19f.: *50*
III. xxi. 8: *2 n. 2*
III. xxi. 25f.: *146*
III. xxi. 27f.: *105*
III. xxii: *151*
III. xxii. 6: *86 n. 89*
III. xxii. 15f.: *50*
III. xxii. 25: *115 n. 226*
III. xxii. 28: *2 n. 2*
III. xxii. 37f.: *123; 124 n. 271; 146*
III. xxiii: *151*
III. xxiv/xxv: *14 n. 41; 151*
IV. i: *153*
IV. i. 67–70: *130*
IV. i. 83ff.: *1 n. 1; 51f.*
IV. i. 87f.: *129*
IV. i. 133: *87 n. 95*
IV. ii: *42f.; 148; 153f.*
IV. ii. 2: *90 n. 105*
IV. ii. 13–18: *42*
IV. ii. 31–38: *124*
IV. ii. 49–56: *42*
IV. ii. 51f.: *106*
IV. iii. 7: *70*
IV. iii. 11: *92*
IV. iv 1ff.: *51*
IV. iv. 15: *1 n. 1*
IV. iv. 33f.: *106*
IV. iv. 47: *112*
IV. iv. 71f.: *112*
IV. iv. 73: *1 n. 1*

IV. iv. 83f.: *51*
IV. v: *153*
IV. v. 2: *86*
IV. v. 29f.: *51*
IV. v. 54: *46*
IV. vi: *153*
IV. vi. 3: *2 n. 2*
IV. vi. 31: *85 n. 87*
IV. vi. 45: *2 n. 2*
IV. vi. 72: *2 n. 2*
IV. vi. 73f.: *106*
IV. vi. 75: *112*
IV. vii: *153*
IV. vii. 15: *2 n. 2*
IV. vii. 23: *107 n. 195*
IV. viii. 12: *1 n. 1*
IV. viii. 15: *107*
IV. viii. 15–22: *126*
IV. viii. 19f.: *45 with n. 191*
IV. viii. 37: *2 n. 2*
IV. viii. 54: *2 n. 2*
IV. ix. 34: *2 n. 2*
IV. ix. 35: *107*
IV. ix. 65f.: *51f.*
IV. ix. 70: *1 n. 1*
IV. ix. 71f.: *51f.*
IV. x. 5: *79 n. 61*
IV. x. 43f.: *1 n. 1; 107; 115 n. 226*
IV. xi: *154*
IV. xi. 8: *1 n. 1*
IV. xi. 15: *111*
IV. xi. 18–20: *88 n. 100*
IV. xi. 23: *79 n. 61*
IV. xi. 40: *107*
IV. ix. 41: *82 n. 73*
IV. xi. 42: *15 n. 42*
IV. xi. 65f.: *51f.*
IV. xi. 69f.: *52*
IV. xi. 73: *111*
IV. xi. 79f.: *91 n. 105*

Sall.
Iug. 45, 4: *106 n. 191*

schol.
E. *Hec.* 5: *90 n. 105*
schol. Ariston.
Hom. *Il.* vii. 482: *45 n. 188*
Hom. *Il.* viii. 1: *45 n. 188*
Hom. *Il.* viii. 53: *45 n. 188*

Sen.
Tr. 587: *44*
Tr. 815ff.: *38 n. 156*

Sidon.
Carm. viii. 6: *126 n. 283*

Soph.
Ai. 650: *108 n. 201*
El. 428–30: *120*
El. 957: *120*
OT 246–51: *120*
Phil. 504–6: *120 n. 250*
Tr. 21–5: *16 n. 46*

Stat.
Silv. IV. viii. 28: *147*
Theb. vi. 227–233: *120*

Theocr.
ii *22 n. 75*
xv *22 n. 75*

Theogn.
579–582: *29 n. 116*

Tib.
I. iv. 18: *112*
i. v. 71–76: *27 n. 107*
II. vi. 42: *105*
III. i *29 n. 116*

Verg.
Ae. vi. 240–2: *118*
ecl. ii *22 n. 75*